NATIONAL ANTI-SLAVERY STANDARD.

L. MARIA CHILD, Editor. | Without Concealment----Without Compromise. | DAVID LEE CHILD, Assistant Editor.

VOLUME III.—NO. 40. | NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1843. | WHOLE NUMBER 144.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At 143, Nassau Street, New-York.

☞ All remittances, and letters relating to the pecuniary concerns of the paper, should be addressed to ISAAC T. HOPPER.

☞ Letters relating to the editorial department should be addressed to L. MARIA CHILD.

TERMS.—$2,00 a year, in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months.

☞ $10,00, in advance, will pay for SIX copies for one year, sent to one address.

☞ TWENTY copies, or more, will be sent to one address, at $1,50 each.

☞ Subscribers can remit money without expense by observing the following rule of the Post Office Department:—"A Postmaster may enclose money in a letter to the publisher of a newspaper, to pay the subscription of a third person, and frank the letter, if written by himself."

H. M. HENRY, PRINTER.

Selections.

From the Boston Atlas.

COLORED MARINERS IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

The following are the remainder of the documents communicated by President Tyler to the House of Representatives of Congress, in compliance with a resolution of the House, proposed by Mr. Adams:

An Act for the better regulation and government of free negroes and persons of color, and for other purposes.

CHAPTER III.

Sec. 1. *Be it enacted by the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives, now met and sitting in General Assembly, and by the authority of the same*, That, from and after the passing of this act, no free negro, or person of color, who shall leave this State, shall be suffered to return; and every person who offends herein, shall be liable to the penalties of the act passed on the twentieth day of December, in the year one thousand eight hundred and twenty, entitled, "An act to restrain the emancipation of slaves, and to prevent free persons of color from entering the State, and for other purposes."

Sec. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That every free male negro, or person of color, between the ages of fifteen and fifty years, within this State, who may not be a native of said State, or shall not have resided therein five years next preceding the passing of this act, shall pay a tax of fifty dollars per annum; and in case said tax shall not be paid, the said free male person of color shall be subject to the penalties of this act against free persons of color coming into this State, passed on the twentieth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and twenty.

Sec. 3. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, That if any vessel shall come into any port or harbor of this State, from any other State or foreign port, having on board any free negroes or persons of color, as cooks, stewards, mariners, or in any other employment on board of said vessel, such free negroes or persons of color shall be liable to be seized and confined in jail, until said vessel shall clear out and depart from this State; and that, when said vessel is ready to sail, the captain of said vessel shall be bound to carry away the said free negro or free person of color, and to pay the expenses of his detention; and, in case of neglect or refusal so to do, he shall be liable to be indicted; and, on conviction thereof, shall be fined in a sum not less than one thousand dollars, and imprisoned not less than two months; and such free negroes or persons of color shall be deemed and taken as absolute slaves, and be sold in conformity to the provisions of the act passed on the twentieth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and twenty, aforesaid.

Sec. 4. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, That the sheriff of Charleston district, and each and every other sheriff of this State, shall be empowered and specially enjoined to carry the provisions of this act into effect, each of whom shall be entitled to one moiety of the proceeds of the sale of all free negroes and free persons of color that may happen to be sold under the provisions of the foregoing clause: *Provided* the prosecution be had at his information.

Sec. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That it shall be the duty of the harbor-master of the port of Charleston to report to the sheriff of Charleston district the arrival of all free negroes, or free persons of color, who may arrive on board any vessel coming into the harbor of Charleston, from any other State or foreign port.

Sec. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That, from and after the passing of this act, it shall be altogether unlawful for any person or persons to hire of any male slave, or slaves, his or their time; and in case any male slave, or slaves, be so permitted by their owner or owners to hire out their own time, labor, or service, the said slave or slaves shall be liable to seizure and forfeiture, in the same manner as has been heretofore enacted in the act in the case of slaves coming into this State contrary to the provisions of the same.

Sec. 7. *And be it further enacted*, That, from and after the first day of June next, every free male negro, mulatto, or mestizo, in this State, above the age of fifteen years, shall be compelled to have a guardian, who shall be a respectable freeholder of the district, in which said free negro or mulatto shall reside; and it shall be the duty of the said guardian, to go before the clerk of the court of the said district, and before him signify his acceptance of the trust, in writing; and at the same time, he shall give to the clerk aforesaid, his certificate, that the said negro, mulatto, or mestizo, for whom he is guardian, is of good character and correct habits; which acceptance and certificate shall be recorded in said office by the clerk, who shall receive for the same, fifty cents; and if any free male negro, mulatto, or mestizo, shall be unable to conform to the requisitions of this act, then and in that case such person or persons shall be dealt with as this act directs for persons of color coming into this State contrary to law; and the amount of sales shall be divided, one half to the informer, and the other half for the use of the State.

Sec. 8. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, That if any person or persons shall counsel, aid, or hire any slave or slaves, free negroes, or persons of color, to raise a rebellion or insurrection, within this State, whether any rebellion or insurrection do actually take place or not, every such person or persons, on conviction thereof, shall be adjudged felons, and suffer death without benefit of clergy.

Sec. 9. *And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, That the commissioners of the cross roads for Charleston neck be, and they are hereby declared to be justices of the peace, ex-officio, in that part of the parish of St. Philip's without the corporate limits of Charleston, for all purposes except for the trial of causes small and mean.

In the Senate house, the first day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-two, and in the forty-seventh year of the independence of the United States of America.

JACOB BONDTON,
President of the Senate.
PATRICK NOBLE,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

—

Mr. Vaughan, to Mr. Van Buren.—[COPY.]

WASHINGTON, Dec. 26, 1830.

It is with great regret that the undersigned, his Britannic majesty's envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, finds himself called upon to represent to the government of the United States the cruel and unjust operation of a law of the State of South Carolina, under which a free man of color, a British subject, has been seized on board a British ship, and imprisoned in the jail of Charleston.

The following is the statement of the case, received from his majesty's consul: Daniel Fraser, a free colored man, born in the British West Indies, and carried, at the age of four years, to Scotland, and undoubtedly a British subject, arrived in the port of Charleston in the month of November last, in the capacity of cook, on board the ship Atlantic, from Liverpool, when he was seized, and sent to prison, under a warrant issued by the sheriff, in virtue of an act passed by the legislature of South Carolina. The third section of that act is in the following words:

"*And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid*, That if any vessel shall come into any port or harbor of this State, from any other State or foreign port, having on board any free negroes or persons of color, as cooks, stewards, mariners, or in any other employment on board said vessels, such free negroes or persons of color shall be liable to be seized and confined in jail, until the said vessel shall clear out and depart from this State; and that, when said vessel is ready to sail, the captain of said vessel shall be bound to carry away the said free negro or person of color, and pay the expenses of his detention; and, in case of his neglect, or refusal to do so, he shall be liable to be indicted, and, on conviction thereof, shall be fined in a sum not less than one thousand dollars, and imprisoned not less than two months; and such free negroes or persons of color shall be deemed and taken as absolute slaves, and be sold in conformity to the provisions of the act passed on the twentieth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and twenty, aforesaid."

The undersigned, desirous of avoiding any discussion with the government of the United States, involving a remonstrance against a State law, directed the British consul at Charleston to endeavor to procure the release of Daniel Fraser, by entering into communication with the proper authorities of that place, trusting, also, that he had only to point out the cruelty and injustice of an act so seriously affecting the commercial intercourse with British subjects, to ensure its repeal.

The undersigned has the honor to inclose copies of the correspondence which has taken place between the British consul, William Ogilby, and the sheriff of Charleston, by which the Secretary of State will perceive how hopeless it is to expect that the magistrates of Charleston will set at liberty Daniel Fraser, or to look forward with any confidence to the repeal of the obnoxious act by the legislature of the State.

Upon reference to a similar remonstrance made by the British minister at Washington, in 1824, the undersigned finds that the government of the United States took the opinion of the attorney-general, who declared that the law of South Carolina, in question, was void, as it was incompatible with the rights of all nations in amity with the United States; that the Constitution gave to Congress the supreme and exclusive power of regulating commerce with foreign nations, and that no State had the right of imposing new restrictions. There is no requisition, in any treaty with Great Britain, that British vessels permitted to enter any ports of the United States, shall be navigated by white men alone.

The undersigned is aware that the general government of the United States cannot control the laws made in the several States, but the undersigned feels it to be his duty to point out the restriction and embarrassment which the State of South Carolina has put upon commercial intercourse with British subjects, in order that measures may be taken for the exact observance, as in the other States of the Union, of the stipulations of the treaties and conventions subsisting between Great Britain and the United States.

The undersigned cannot refrain from calling, earnestly, for prompt attention to the subject of this note, in order to avoid any future remonstrance, not unlikely to be occasioned in consequence of the intercourse being re-established between the British West Indies and the United States.

The undersigned has the honor to renew to Mr. Van Buren the assurance of his highest consideration.

CHAS. R. VAUGHAN.

The Hon. MARTIN VAN BUREN, &c.

—

Mr. Ogilby, to Mr. Steedman.—[COPY.]

BRITISH CONSULATE,
CHARLESTON, Dec. 15, 1830.

SIR,—I should have done myself the honor of addressing you, ere this, on a subject to which I have already called your attention several times, in our interviews within the last fortnight, namely, the imprisonment of Daniel Fraser, a free man of color, belonging to the British ship Atlantic, now in this port; but, being impressed with a due sense of the peculiar difficulties this State has to contend with, by reason of its very numerous slave population, and of the anxious wish which I know is entertained by his majesty's government, to perpetuate the friendly relations and feelings which so happily exist, at the present time, between our respective countries, I felt, and still feel, an extreme reluctance to agitate a question which, I am aware, has already given rise, in more than one instance, to a good deal of excitement in this State; but the protracted imprisonment of the seaman before named, and the assurance I have recently received, from the best authority, that, on some former occasions, British colored seamen who were imprisoned here, under the third section of the legislative act of this State, were released by the authorities, on the application of his majesty's consul, and given up to him without the payment of any costs, obliges me to consider it imperatively my duty, as British consul, to request of you the release of the British subject before mentioned, Daniel Fraser, under the assurance that I shall not fail to impress upon the captain of the Atlantic the propriety of confining this seaman to his ship, and not allowing him to hold communion with any of the colored population of this city.

I have the honor, &c.

WILLIAM OGILBY,
British Consul for the State of South Carolina.

C. J. STEEDMAN, Esq. *Sheriff, Charleston.*

—

Mr. Steedman, to Mr. Ogilby.

SHERIFF'S OFFICE, Dec. 16, 1830.

SIR,—Your letter of yesterday, relative to the imprisonment of Daniel Fraser, a free man of color, belonging to the British ship Atlantic, has been submitted to the attorney-general of the State, and I now have the honor of inclosing his answer.

I exceedingly regret that I am constrained, against my inclination, to adhere to the law which imperatively enforces on me the confinement of the man; and beg leave to assure you that if I could, consistently with my duty, release him, it would afford me pleasure to do so.

I have the honor, &c.

CHARLES J. STEEDMAN.

WILLIAM OGILBY, Esq. *British Consul, &c.*

—

Mr. Legare, to Mr. Steedman.

SIR,—I regret exceedingly, that, from the very imperative character of the acts of assembly, relating to the introduction of free persons of color into this State, I do not feel myself at liberty to take any steps, or give any counsel, towards accomplishing the object of Mr. Ogilby's letter. I regret it the more, because the conciliatory and friendly tone in which that letter is written, is in perfect accordance with my own feelings, and with what I believe to be the public feeling in regard to our intercourse with Great Britain and her dependencies.

But, as a member of the legislature, I know that several efforts have been made, within a few years past, to relax the policy of those laws, and that they have all *decidedly* failed. It is not more than a fortnight, since I had myself the honor of reporting a bill, from the Charleston delegation, to relieve the commerce of Charleston of some of the embarrassments occasioned by these acts; but this bill, too, it seems, has failed, even in the House of Representatives—that branch of the legislature hitherto most favorable to the amendments proposed.

Under all circumstances, I think the law must take its course, however unwilling the officers who are bound to enforce it may be to enter into a conflict with a friendly foreign power, so much respected by us. I have the honor, &c.

HUGH S. LEGARE, *Attorney-General.*

TO CHARLES J. STEEDMAN, Esq.
Sheriff of Charleston District.

—

Mr. Vaughan, to Mr. Van Buren.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 15, 1831.

The undersigned, his Britannic majesty's envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, begs leave to inform the Secretary of State of the United States, that he has received a letter (a copy of which is inclosed) from Mr. Ogilby, his Britannic majesty's consul at Charleston, South Carolina, stating that Daniel Fraser, a free man of color, and a British subject, whose arrest and imprisonment gave occasion to the representation which the undersigned had the honor to make to Mr. Van Buren, on the 20th December last, has been released, and restored to his vessel. As it may possibly be inferred, from the release of Fraser, that satisfaction has been granted by the magistrates of Charleston for the wrong done to a British subject, which called for the remonstrance made by the undersigned, he thinks it is his duty to make Mr. Van Buren acquainted with the circumstances attending the release of Fraser.

By a reference to the inclosed letter, it will appear that Fraser was not released from prison until the vessel to which he belonged had been removed to a position at such a distance from Charleston that the crew could not communicate with that town; and that the amount of the expenses incurred for his subsistence in jail, was exacted. Redress, however, for the individual arrested, has not been so much the object of the representation made by the undersigned, as to obtain from the government of the United States an assurance that the acts of the legislature of South Carolina would not, in future, counteract the stipulations contained in the treaties and conventions which regulate the intercourse of British subjects with this country. On these grounds, the undersigned is particularly anxious to be able to lay before his majesty's government the view taken by the President, of the embarrassment which has been occasioned by the State law of South Carolina.

The undersigned has the honor to renew to Mr. Van Buren the assurance of his highest consideration.

CHAS. R. VAUGHAN.

The Hon. MARTIN VAN BUREN, &c.

—

BRITISH CONSULATE,
CHARLESTON, Jan. 2, 1831.

SIR—I am happy to have the honor of informing you of my having succeeded, on Friday last, in obtaining the release from prison of Daniel Fraser, the colored seaman belonging to the British ship Atlantic, in consequence of his ship having hauled into the stream, at a distance from the wharves, to take in a cargo of timber; and the crew being thereby prevented from holding communication with the shore, the authorities here agreed to release him, but not until the captain of the Atlantic had paid the expenses of his subsistence.

I have the honor, &c.

WM. OGILBY, *Consul.*

The Rt. Hon. CHAS. R. VAUGHAN, &c.

RIGHTS OF COLORED SEAMEN.

The following communication is from Mr. Berrien, *of Georgia*, then Attorney-General of the United States, to the President:

MARCH 25, 1831.

SIR—I have read the communication, with its accompanying documents, which the right honorable Charles R. Vaughan, his Britannic majesty's envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, addressed to the Department of State, and which you did me the honor to refer to me. I have examined the question thus presented to your consideration, with the anxious care which is due to the intrinsic importance of the subject, and to the solicitude of this government to preserve and cherish the good understanding which happily subsists between the United States and Great Britain. I have not been unmindful of the previous communications between the two governments, in relation to this matter. Indeed, my chief embarrassment has arisen from the fact and nature of those communications, from the decided and unqualified opinion of my own immediate predecessor, and from the acts and communications of those to whom the executive functions of this government have been heretofore confided, in apparent harmony with it. Heretofore, the only question considered by this government seems to have been, whether a law of South Carolina, conflicting with the provisions of the convention with Great Britain, and with the commercial laws of the United States, is constitutionally valid. The fact of such conflict has been assumed, as it appears to me, without a sufficient attention to the terms of the convention or the laws of the Union. My belief is, that no such conflict exists in fact; that, on the contrary, there is perfect harmony between the legislation of South Carolina and the United States. Lest, however, I should err in this opinion, and because I cannot acquiesce in the doctrines heretofore avowed, even upon the state of facts which was assumed in that discussion, I believe that I shall more certainly discharge my duty, and meet your expectations, by considering this question in all its various aspects.

The communication of his Britannic majesty's minister presents the following statement of facts:

Daniel Fraser, a free colored man, born in the British West Indies, carried thence to Scotland at an early age, and undoubtedly a British subject, arrived in the port of Charleston, in the capacity of a cook, on board the ship Atlantic, from Liverpool, when he was seized and committed to prison, under a warrant issued by the sheriff, acting under the authority of an act of the legislature of South Carolina. In consequence of directions to that effect, given by his Britannic majesty's minister, the British consul at Charleston used his endeavors to procure the release of Fraser, by entering into communication with the proper authorities of that place; and, in point of fact, he was eventually released, and restored to his vessel on her removal to a position at such distance from Charleston that the crew could not communicate with that city, and on the payment of the expenses incurred for his subsistence in jail.

His Britannic majesty's minister informs the Secretary of State that redress for the injury to the individual arrested, is not so much the object of his representation, as to obtain from the government of the United States an assurance that the acts of the legislature of South Carolina would not, in future, counteract the stipulations contained in the treaties and conventions which regulate the intercourse of British subjects with this country. It becomes necessary, then, to examine the provisions of these compacts.

The commercial convention of 1815, first continued for ten years by the convention of 1818, and afterwards indefinitely by that of 1827, in its first article provides for a reciprocal liberty of commerce between the territories of the United States of America and his Britannic majesty's territories in Europe. It gives to the inhabitants of the two countries, respectively, liberty, freely and securely, to come with their ships and cargoes to all those places, ports, and rivers, in their respective territories, to which other foreigners are permitted to come; to enter, remain, and reside there; to hire and occupy houses for the purposes of their commerce; and generally to enjoy complete protection and security for the same, subject to the laws and statutes of the two countries, respectively.

It is to the rights secured to British subjects, by the stipulations of this article, that his Britannic majesty's minister appeals; and it will of course be indispensable to consider how far, giving full effect to these stipulations, the act of the legislature of South Carolina can be considered valid. But a further view is rendered necessary. The statement or summary furnished by the Department of State, shows that this question is now for the first time presented to this government. A similar complaint was made in 1823, by the minister of Great Britain, and renewed in 1824; and, on a reference to the attorney-general of the United States, he expressed the opinion that the law of South Carolina was void, as well because it conflicted with the general commercial laws of the United States, as with the treaty in question. It may be proper, therefore, further to consider the validity of the act of South Carolina; assuming, for the purpose of the inquiry, the fact that such conflict exists in its relation to those laws.

The act in question is entitled, "an act for the better regulation and government of free negroes and persons of color, and for other purposes;" and in its third section it provides—

"That if any vessel shall come into any port or harbor of this State, (South Carolina,) from any other State or foreign port, having on board any free negroes or persons of color, as cooks, stewards, mariners, or in any other employment on board said vessel, such free negroes or persons of color shall be liable to be seized and confined in jail until said vessel shall clear out and depart from this State; and that, when said vessel is ready to sail, the captain of said vessel shall be bound to carry away the said free negro or person of color, and pay the expenses of his detention; and, in case of his neglect or refusal to do so, he shall be liable to be indicted, and on conviction thereof, shall be fined in a sum not less than one thousand dollars, and imprisoned not less than two months; and such free negroes or persons of color shall be deemed and taken as absolute slaves, and sold, in conformity to the provisions of the act passed on the twentieth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and twenty, aforesaid."

Under the general commercial laws of the United States, and the particular provisions of the commercial convention with Great Britain, a right is alledged, in behalf of the subjects of the latter, to enter the ports of the former, with ships or vessels having free colored seamen on board. The law of South Carolina inhibits such persons from coming into that State, and subjects the parties offending to the restraints and penalties prescribed by the act. Is this law of South Carolina constitutionally valid, notwithstanding the commercial laws of the United States, and the convention above referred to?

In examining this question, it will be proper to consider—

1. The power of the legislature of South Carolina to pass this law.

2. How far it may constitutionally operate, notwithstanding its liability incidentally to conflict with the general commercial laws of the United States, and the particular conventions with great Britain.

3. Whether this law does, in point of fact, conflict with the laws of the United States, or with the commercial convention with Great Britain.

Apart from the supposed liability of the act of South Carolina to conflict with the laws of the United States and the convention with Great Britain, the right of the legislature of that State to pass such a law, cannot, I apprehend, be doubted. In the general distribution of powers between the federal and State governments, the power to regulate its own internal police, was clearly reserved to each State. We are told in the contemporary vindication of the Constitution of the United States, which is so often appealed to, in discussions of this sort, that the powers delegated to the federal government by that instrument are few and defined, operating chiefly on external objects; while those which remain with the States, are numerous and indefinite, extending to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concerns the lives, liberties, and properties of the people, and the internal order, improvement, and prosperity of the State. The act of South Carolina which we are considering, has for its object the regulation and government of free persons of color within the limits of that State, and as strictly belongs to its internal police, as a law regulating the course of descents, or one defining the crime of murder, and prescribing the penalty which shall attach to its commission. I do not, however, apprehend that the power of the State of South Carolina to pass this law, is doubted. The general right of a State to regulate persons of color within its own limits, is one too clearly recognized by the tenth amendment to the Constitution, to be drawn into controversy. The claim presented by the communication of the minister of his Britannic majesty, and sustained by the opinion of my predecessor, is intended to deny the legal validity of this act, in so far as it conflicts with the provisions of the laws of the United States which regulate the entry of foreign vessels into our ports, and with the commercial convention with Great Britain, which guaranties to the subjects of that nation complete protection and security for their commerce, and free entrance into our ports with their ships and vessels. The power of South Carolina to regulate free persons of color within her limits, is admitted; but the right of the United States, under the authority to regulate commerce with foreign nations; or, in the exercise of the treaty-making power, to extend the protection of the United States, even within the limits of South Carolina, to such persons of color, is also asserted; and then the argument is, that the law of South Carolina, which is subordinate, must bend to those of the Union, which are supreme. I do not admit the existence of this conflict; but, lest I should err in that opinion, I am thus called to consider the second inquiry proposed; viz:

How far this act of South Carolina can constitutionally operate, notwithstanding its liability incidentally to conflict with the commercial laws of the United States, and the conventions with Great Britain?

The power to regulate commerce with foreign nations is vested in Congress, by the Constitution; and the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, has authority to make treaties. Are these powers unlimited? Does the Constitution impose no restraint upon their exercise? If in terms it does not, is no restriction imposed, and necessarily so, by the nature of our political association, by those great and fundamental principles which are at all times, and equally, obligatory upon communities and individuals? If the enforcement of a law passed by the legislature of a State, in the clear and undisputed exercise of its reserved rights of sovereignty, be vitally essential to the safety of its people, may Congress, in the exercise of its granted powers, capriciously, and at will, so extend its legislation as that it shall in its operation incidentally conflict with such State law, and thereby annul it, *pro tanto*—whether such extension is, or is not, indispensable to the execution of the granted power? And is the national legislature the sole judge of this necessity? There is presumption, perhaps, in the mere suggestion of these inquiries. I am not unmindful of what was said by the court in the case of *Gibbons* and *Ogden*, and am entirely sensible of the respectful consideration to which even the *dicta* of that high tribunal are justly entitled. But the proposition there announced was not essential to the decision of the pending controversy; and it ceased to be authoritative, as soon as it had passed that limit. The counsel for the defendant in error, in that case, sought to sustain the acts of the legislature of New-York—

1st. As acts passed in the exercise of a concurrent power to regulate commerce.

2d. As police laws.

It was sufficient for all the purposes of that decision to affirm, as the court did, in fact, substantially affirm, that the acts of the legislature of New York, were laws affecting commerce, which conflicted, in their operation, with the laws of the United States, passed in the exercise of the power given by the Constitution, "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and between the several States," and incidentally, between the ports of the same State. It was not indispensable to decide how far a law, passed by a State legislature, in the exercise of an undisputed power to regulate its own internal police, and plainly limited to that object, must yield to an act of Congress, enacted under the authority to regulate commerce, in the event of an incidental conflict, which might have been avoided, without restraining the full exercise of the constitutional power of the federal government. That question, therefore, is still open to inquiry. If it be objected, that the affirmance of the validity of the State law, in the case supposed, would be to establish a principle, of which the practical application will be often difficult, and always embarrassing, the answer is, that such a consequence is the unavoidable result of our complex system of government. Without doubt, it would add to the simplicity of the rule of construction, adopted in the interpretation of our constitutional codes, to assert, in one general proposition, the absolute and unqualified supremacy of the federal enactments. But how far this would comport with the intentions of their framers; how far it would consist with the rights of the respective parties, and tend to the perpetuity of the Union, which it is their object to uphold and preserve, is another, and, as I apprehend, a very different question.

The view which I have of this subject, shall be briefly stated. The powers granted to the federal government are supreme. In so far as the exercise of these powers is intrusted to Congress, they are authorized to carry them into full effect; but certain powers are as clearly reserved to the States. If the plenary execution of the federal charter be essential to the efficiency of that government, the continued exercise of the powers reserved to the States may be alike indispensable to their existence as such. What is especially desirable is, to avoid such an exertion of the several powers of the two governments, as may impair the efficiency of the former, or jeopard the safety of the latter. The conflict between their respective enactments, which it is so desirable to shun, it is often difficult to avoid. Laws, passed even in the execution of powers essentially distinct in their nature, may be so extended in their operation upon men and things as incidentally to conflict with each other, and in cases which were unforeseen by their framers. "All experience shows (says the Supreme Court, in the case referred to) that the same measure or measures, scarcely distinguishable from each other, may flow from distinct powers." It is an easy solution of the difficulty to maintain that, whenever in the operation of the laws of the federal and State governments, such unforeseen and incidental conflicts shall occur, the enactments of the latter, however indispensable to their safety, or even to their existence, shall yield to those of the former, however superfluous; that a State law, the enforcement of which is of vital importance to that State, shall bend to the authority of an act of Congress, whose provisions may incidentally conflict with it, although those provisions are not indispensable to the plenary exercise of the power which the Constitution intended to confer, or to give effect to all the purposes for which it was conferred. But I cannot, for myself, acquiesce in this mode of interpreting our fundamental charter. I repeat the concession, that the powers granted to Congress are supreme. Whatever is *indispensable* to their plenary exercise, the legislature of the Union has the power to enact, and State legislation must bend beneath its sway. But if the means by which such granted power may be carried into effect, are various, and alike efficient—if its exercise, in one mode will consist with the unfettered exertion of the reserved powers of the States, while the use of a different means will, by producing a conflict with State legislation, paralyze the reserved rights of those sovereignties—the selection of the former mode, becomes, I apprehend, a duty of constitutional obligation. In the view which I have of this subject, the right of Congress, even in the exercise of its expressly granted powers, to control the legislation of the States, results, and results only, from the *necessity* of such control to *the efficient exercise of the granted power*. It is not a right capriciously and at will to select from various modes, all of which are equally efficient, that which will conflict with, and therefore control, the enactments of the State legislature. To give to the acts of the federal legislature this controlling influence, they must be *indispensable to the due execution of the power intended to be carried into effect.*

Take, for example, the commercial power.

The power of Congress to regulate commerce, may be considered as exclusive, and the authority of the federal government as supreme, over all subjects within the constitutional sphere of its action. The result will be, that State laws which conflict with its rightful exercise of this power, must necessarily yield. I say, which conflict with its rightful exercise; because it has limits, which are prescribed by the Constitution; and those, moreover, which necessarily belong to the nature of the federal association.

Congress has power to regulate commerce; and authority is given to that body, by the Constitution, to pass all laws which may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying into effect its granted powers. The right to pass such laws, would have been a necessary inference from the powers granted. Why, then, was it expressly conferred? I apprehend it was so conferred to serve as a limitation upon that right, restricting it to such laws as are "*necessary and proper.*" So exercised, the laws which are passed to carry it into effect, are supreme. State legislation must yield to them, for such is our federal compact. To the extent to which the right of Congress to regulate commerce must *necessarily conflict* with the right of a State to regulate its own internal police, the latter right will be presumed to have been surrendered by the adoption of the federal Constitution by the respective States. But if, for the purposes of the constitutional grant, the power may be exercised without producing such conflict, the obligation so to exercise it, is imperative; because, in this event, the law, or regulation which produces such conflict, is not *necessary*, and *therefore* is not proper to carry that power into effect.

If this be true (as I apprehend it is) in relation to the legislative action, it is true also in reference to all those who are called to the interpretation of its power. A law, or commercial regulation, which is general in its terms, will, in obedience to this principle, be so construed as to restrict its operation within limits which may consist with the true interpretation of the granted power.

If the power to regulate their own police be, as I think it is, clearly reserved to the respective States, laws passed by the general government, in the exercise of the right to regulate commerce, cannot control the exercise of this reserved power of the States, except in so far as those laws may be both *necessary and proper* to the preservation of the commerce of the Union. The consequence is, as I apprehend, that the police laws of the several States must continue to operate without prejudice to the efficient exercise of the commercial power; that the power of Congress itself, over the subject, is liable to this restriction; and that, subject to this limitation, the general terms of a law or commercial regulation of the federal legislature must be so construed as to allow their operation.

If, now, we inquire how far, in relation to the subject immediately under consideration, the power of Congress may be exercised without paralyzing the legislation of South Carolina, the answer seems to be, that the admission of colored seamen indiscriminately into all the ports of the United States, is a matter rather of convenience than of necessity; that it is in the power of Congress to exclude them; and that if, in truth, their admission into the ports of the slaveholding States is forbidden by the laws, because dangerous to the safety of the people of those States, it is their duty to do so; that such a modification of our commercial regulations as would exclude them from the ports of the slaveholding States, leaving them free to enter all our other ports, whether such regulations be made by law or by treaties, could furnish no just ground of complaint to other nations; would in no degree impair our commerce; or, if injurious to it at all, would be so exclusively to the commerce of those for whose protection it was established, and within whose limits alone the exclusion would operate. But if this view be correct, the obligation of Congress so to exercise the power, would seem to follow; and it would result, as a necessary consequence, that the general terms of a treaty, or of an act of Congress, affecting the subject matter, must receive a corresponding interpretation.

I am not, therefore, prepared to affirm that an act of the legislature of South Carolina, which inhibits the entrance of free persons of color into that State, is necessarily invalid, because, under the general terms of the commercial laws or treaties of the United States, such persons might, in the absence of this law, claim such entrance. On the contrary, I think that such an act of legislation is, under the circumstances which I have supposed, a justifiable exercise of the reserved powers of that State, and ought to have effect; that Congress are under a constitutional obligation to respect it in the formation of treaties, and in the enactment of laws; and that those who are called to interpret their acts, are equally bound so to construe them as to restrain the generality of their expressions within the limits of this obligation.

Upon what other principle than this, can we explain the operation of the quarantine laws of the several States? They act directly upon the commerce of the Union; and yet they emanate exclusively from the States. They restrain that commerce, and control the enactments of the national legislature, made for its regulation; and yet they are permitted to operate. In the case of Gibbons *vs.* Ogden, speaking of the quarantine laws, the court say: "The constitutionality of such laws, so far as we are informed, has never been denied." Whence is it, then, that the rights acquired by foreigners, under the general commercial laws of the United States, or under the particular conventions entered into between this government and that of which they are subjects or citizens, are controlled by the quarantine laws of the several States, enacted in the exercise by those States of the reserved right to regulate their own internal police, and are yet beyond the reach of all other control by laws emanating from the very same source, enacted for the selfsame objects, and which are even more vitally indispensable to the personal security of the citizen? Is the right of self-protection limited to defense against physical pestilence? It would be too revolting to arrogate to the federal government a power which would deny to a State the right of guarding its citizens from the contagion of disease. When the peculiar situation of the slaveholding States is considered, would it be less—nay would it not be infinitely more—revolting to withhold from them the power of protecting themselves as they may, against the introduction among their colored people of that moral contagion, compared with which, physical pestilence, in the utmost imaginable extent of its horrors, would be light and trifling?

Will it be said that the quarantine regulations of the several States, having been recognized by Congress, derive their authority from that source, and not from the legislation of States? The answer seems to be obvious. From the adoption of the federal Constitution, until May, 1796, Congress did not legislate upon this subject at all, and the short enactment which was approved on that day simply authorizes the President to direct certain officers of the United States, to aid in the execution of *the health laws of the several States.* The act of 1799, only reiterates the same injunction to the officers themselves, and makes certain provisions connected with the customs, to conform to the requisitions of those laws. There is no pretense of giving the sanction of Congress to these enactments. They are dealt with as laws of perfect obligation, emanating from the authority of the States, as acts of State legislation, which are valid, efficient, and actively obligatory.

I repeat the inquiry, then: Upon what principle is it, that these laws of quarantine, emanating solely from the authority of the States, and operating directly upon the commerce of the Union, are allowed to have a constitutional validity and effect, which are denied to the act under consideration? Founded on the same reserved right—the right of the State to regulate its own internal police; and devoted to the same object—the personal security of the citizen; I am unable to ascribe to either a constitutional validity or effect, which does not seem to me equally to belong to the other.

So far, then, as the penal provisions of the act of the legislature of South Carolina are essential to prevent the ingress of free persons of color into that State, it is, I apprehend, valid and obligatory; and except where the operation of the act may interfere with the rights existing under the commercial laws or conventions of the United States, the legislature of South Carolina is the exclusive judge of this necessity. In its relation to those rights, the validity of those provisions would seem to me to be dependent upon the consideration which I have stated; and if it could be supposed that Great Britain, or any other nation, would continue to employ colored seamen in their commercial intercourse with South Carolina, it might be advisable to correspond with the governor of that State, with a view to obtain such a modification of the provisions of the act, as, without frustrating its purpose, might render its operation less burdensome to mariners of that description. I do not, however, believe, sir, that such mariners will be hereafter employed in that navigation. If I am right in the view which I am about to present to you, the right so to employ them, cannot be derived from the convention with Great Britain; nor can they be so employed, without violating the laws of the United States.

I proceed to the last inquiry, suggested in the preceding part of this letter. In all the discussions on this subject hitherto, the concluding clause in the first article of the convention between the United States and Great Britain, seems to me to have been overlooked. It is under this article, that liberty of commerce, and a free and secure entry into our ports, is claimed for all the subjects of Great Britain. But these privileges are granted with a qualification, which is distinctly expressed in the concluding clause of the article. They are to be freely enjoyed, "but *subject always to the laws and statutes of the two countries, respectively.*"

The master of an American vessel sailing from Charleston to Liverpool, having his own slave on board, in the same capacity in which Daniel Fraser was employed in the Atlantic, would find himself, on his arrival at that port, without the protection of the treaty, in a contest with that slave for his right to freedom. The law of England, we are told, so abhors slavery, that the slave who touches her soil becomes from that moment free; and her courts have decided that the owner cannot maintain trover for the recovery of his negro slave. It was but the other day, that the judge of a British court of vice admiralty enforced this principle in the case of a cargo of slaves wrecked on the coast of one of the British West India islands, in an American vessel, on her transit from Baltimore to New Orleans. The rights of hospitality, which are as sacred as the stipulations of a treaty, could not secure to the American owner the control of his property. The statement is made on the authority of a newspaper, but is believed to be true. Within her own limits Great Britain enforces her own laws, the treaty notwithstanding. Why should not the rule operate reciprocally on the master or mariners of an English vessel sailing from Liverpool to Charleston? Why should not the cook of that vessel be subject to the laws of South Carolina, on his arrival within a port of that State? Is it because these are the laws of a *State*, and not of the United States? Is the law of a separate State, then, not included in the term, "the laws and statutes of the two countries, respectively?" A legislative act is not less a "law or statute of the country," because the sphere in which it operates is not co-extensive with the whole country. All that is required is, that it should be enacted by authority which is competent within that sphere, and that this should be within the country. The custom of *gavel-kind* is not less a part of the law of England, because it prevails only in Kent, North Wales, and a few other places. And are not the laws of police of the several British West India islands, and of the other provincial governments, dependent on that power, "laws and statutes" of that country, within the meaning of the treaty? But what laws of the United States, strictly so called, other than those which regulate the customs, does the objection suppose will be found operating in the port of Charleston, subject to which this right of entry and commerce is to be enjoyed? And is the foreign navigator, then, to be exempted from the operation of the police laws of that State, while his vessel is lying in her port?

Let us take again the case of the quarantine laws. These are State laws, emanating from State authority; police laws, enacted for the regulation of the internal concerns of the State, and for the protection of its citizens. No one doubts, the treaty notwithstanding, that these laws are obligatory upon the foreign navigator. Nay, it is not to be questioned that they were distinctly within the view of the parties in framing this article. He is then bound to observe these laws. The commercial rights which he enjoys are liable to be restrained by the quarantine laws of a State. What exempts him from the operation of the other police laws of the same State? Those who contract with us are presumed to understand the nature of our institutions. The power to pass all laws which may be deemed necessary for the regulation of its own internal police belongs exclusively to each State; Congress cannot exercise it. The terms used in the convention, "the laws and statutes of the two countries, respectively," must be presumed, then, to have been used with a perfect understanding that they would include the police laws of the respective States.

But the act of bringing Daniel Fraser, a person of color, into the port of Charleston, was expressly forbidden by the laws of the United States. By an act, entitled, "An act to prevent the importation of certain persons into certain States, where, by the laws thereof, their admission is prohibited," masters or captains of ships or vessels are forbidden, under a severe penalty, to "import or bring, or cause to be imported or brought, any negro, mulatto, or person of color, not being a native, or citizen, or registered seaman of the United States, or seamen, natives of countries beyond the Cape of Good Hope, into any port or place of the United States, which port or place shall be situated in any State, which, by law, has prohibited, or shall prohibit, the admission or importation of such negro, mulatto, or other person of color." The terms used in the act, to *import* or *bring*,

and *importation* or *admission*, are intended to apply, with the exceptions specified, of "*native citizens or registered seamen of the United States*," and "*seamen, natives of countries beyond the Cape of Good Hope*," to all other persons of color, *free* or *slave*; and that the framers of the act were aware that such would be its operation, is manifest from the fact that a proviso is added, expressly for the purpose of preventing the act from being "construed to prohibit the admission of Indians."

The second section prohibits such vessels from being *admitted to entry*; and provides that, "if any such negro, mulatto, or other person of color, shall be landed from on board any ship or vessel in any of the ports or places aforesaid, or on the coast of any State prohibiting the admission or importation as aforesaid, the said ship or vessel, with the tackle," &c. "shall be forfeited," &c.

I have not been able to discover that this law has been repealed or modified; and if not, the legislation of Congress is in perfect harmony with that of the State. It recognizes the authority of the State to pass this law, and comes in aid of its enforcement. It is at least as authoritative a recognition of State laws inhibiting the admission of persons of color, as the acts of Congress of 1796 and 1799 are of the quarantine laws of the several States; and this law, as well as those which it recognizes and enforces, are within the terms of the convention—*laws and statutes of this country*; subject to which, the rights of commerce and navigation, secured by that compact, are to be enjoyed. Neither is it to be doubted that the general provisions of the commercial laws of the United States, which regulate the right of entry into the ports of the United States, must be construed so as to give effect to this law."

Such, sir, are the views which I entertain on the question which you have referred to me. I should not have deemed it necessary to enter into this extended examination of it, but for the conflicting opinion which appears to have been entertained by those to whom the executive functions of this government have been heretofore confided.

JOHN MACPHERSON BERRIEN.

To the President of the United States.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the resolution of the House of Representatives, of the 22d instant, requesting me to communicate to the House "whatever correspondence or communication may have been received from the British government respecting the President's construction of the late British treaty concluded at Washington, as it concerns an alledged right to visit American vessels," I herewith transmit a report made to me by the Secretary of State. I have also thought proper to communicate copies of Lord Aberdeen's letter of the 20th December, 1841, to Mr. Everett; Mr. Everett's letter, of the 23d December, in reply thereto; and extracts from several letters of Mr. Everett to the Secretary of State.

I cannot forego the expression of my regret, and the apparent purport of a part of Lord Aberdeen's despatch to Mr. Fox. I had cherished the hope that all possibility of misunderstanding as to the true construction of the eighth article of the treaty lately concluded between Great Britain and the United States, was precluded by the plain and well weighed language in which it is expressed. The desire of both governments is to put an end, as speedily as possible, to the slave trade; and that desire, I need scarcely add, is as strongly and sincerely felt by the United States, as it can be by Great Britain. Yet it must not be forgotten that the trade, though now universally reprobated, was, up to a late period, prosecuted by all who chose to engage in it; and there were unfortunately but very few Christian powers whose subjects were not permitted, and even encouraged, to share in the profits of what was regarded as a perfectly legitimate commerce. It originated at a period long before the United States had become independent, and was carried on within our borders, in opposition to the most earnest remonstrances and expostulations of some of the colonies in which it was most actively prosecuted. Its character, thus fixed by common consent and general practice, could only be changed by the positive assent of each and every nation, expressed either in the form of municipal law, or conventional arrangement. The United States led the way, in efforts to suppress it. They claimed no right to dictate to others; but they resolved, without waiting for the co-operation of other powers, to prohibit it to their own citizens, and to visit its perpetration by them with condign punishment. I may safely affirm that it never occurred to this government that any new maritime right accrued to it from the position it had thus assumed in regard to the slave trade. If, before our laws for its suppression, the flag of every nation might traverse the ocean unquestioned by our cruisers, this freedom was not, in our opinion, in the least abridged by our municipal legislation. Any other doctrine, it is plain, would subject to an arbitrary and ever-varying system of maritime police, adopted at will by the great naval power for the time being, the trade of the world in any places, or in any articles, which such power might see fit to prohibit to its own subjects or citizens. A principle of this kind could scarcely be acknowledged, without subjecting commerce to the risk of constant and harrassing vexations. The attempt to justify such a pretension, from the right to visit and detain ships upon reasonable suspicion of piracy, would deservedly be exposed to universal condemnation, since it would be an attempt to convert an established rule of maritime law, incorporated as a principle into the international code, by the consent of all nations, into a rule and principle adopted by a single nation, and enforced only by its assumed authority. To seize and detain a ship, upon suspicion of piracy, with probable cause, and in good faith, affords no just ground either for complaint on the part of the nation whose flag she bears, or claim of indemnity on the part of the owner. The universal law sanctions, and the common good requires, the existence of such a rule. The right, under such circumstances, not only to visit and detain, but to search a ship, is a perfect right, and involves neither responsibility nor indemnity. But with this single exception, no nation has, in time of peace, any authority to detain the ships of another upon the high seas, on any pretext whatever, beyond the limits of the territorial jurisdiction. And such, I am happy to find, is substantially the doctrine of Great Britain herself, in her most recent official declarations, and even in those now communicated to the House. These declarations may well lead us to doubt whether the apparent difference between the two governments is not rather one of definition than of principle. Not only is the right of *search*, properly so called, disclaimed by Great Britain, but even that of mere visit and inquiry is asserted with qualifications inconsistent with the idea of a perfect right. In the dispatch of Lord Aberdeen to Mr. Everett, of the 20th of December, 1831, as also in that just received by the British minister in this country, made to Mr. Fox, his lordship declares, that if, in spite of all the precaution which shall be used to prevent such occurrences, an American ship, by reason of any visit or detention by a British cruiser, "should suffer loss and injury, it would be followed by prompt and ample remuneration." And in order to make more manifest her intentions in this respect, Lord Aberdeen, in the dispatch of the 20th December, makes known to Mr. Everett the nature of the instructions given to the British cruisers. These are such as, if faithfully observed, would enable the British government to approximate the standard of a fair indemnity. That government has, in several cases, fulfilled her promise in this particular, by making adequate reparation for damage done to our commerce. It seems obvious to remark, that a right which is only to be exercised under such restrictions and precautions, and risk, in case of any assignable damage, to be followed by the consequences of a trespass, can scarcely be considered anything more than a privilege asked for, and either conceded or withheld on the usual principles of international comity.

The principles laid down in Lord Aberdeen's despatches, and the assurances of indemnity therein held out, although the utmost reliance was placed on the good faith of the British government, were not regarded by the executive as a sufficient security against the abuses which Lord Aberdeen admitted might arise in even the most cautious and moderate exercise of their new maritime police. And therefore, in my message at the opening of the last session, I set forth the views entertained by the executive on this subject, and substantially affirmed both our inclination and ability to enforce our own laws, protect our flag from abuse, and acquit ourselves of all our duties and obligations on the high seas. In view of these assertions, the treaty of Washington was negotiated; and upon consultation with the British negotiator, as to the quantum of force necessary to be employed in order to attain these objects, the result to which the most deliberate estimate led, was embodied in the eighth article of the treaty.

Such were my views at the time of negotiating that treaty, and such, in my opinion, is its plain and fair interpretation. I regarded the eighth article as removing all possible pretext, on the ground of mere necessity, to visit and detain our ships upon the African coast, because of any alledged abuse of our flag by slave traders of other nations. We had taken upon ourselves the burden of preventing any such abuse, by stipulating to furnish an armed force—regarded by both the high contracting parties as sufficient to accomplish that object. Denying, as we did and do, all color of right to exercise any such general police over the flags of independent nations, we did not, demand of Great Britain any formal renunciation of her pretensions. Still less had we the least idea of yielding anything ourselves in that respect. We chose to make a practical settlement of the question. This we owed to what we had already done upon this subject. The honor of the country called for it—the honor of its flag demanded that it should not be used by others to cover an iniquitous traffic. This government, I am very sure, has both the inclination and ability to do this; and, if need be, it will not content itself with a fleet of eighty guns; but sooner than any foreign government shall exercise the province of executing its laws, and fulfilling its obligations, the highest of which is to protect its flag alike from abuse or insult, it would, I doubt not, put in requisition for that purpose, its whole naval power. The purpose of this government is faithfully to fulfill the treaty on its part; and it will not permit itself to doubt that Great Britain will comply with it on hers. In this way, peace will be best preserved, and the most amicable relations maintained between the two countries.

JOHN TYLER.

DOCUMENT FROM MR. WEBSTER.

Washington, Feb. 27, 1843.

On going into the clerk's room, and examining a large pile of documents that came with the message, I found the following very important document, from the Secretary of State, which I have copied, and sent you:

To the Hon. the Speaker, &c. &c.—

The Secretary of State, to whom has been referred a resolution of the House of Representatives of the 22d inst. requesting that the President of the United States be requested to communicate to that House, if not in his opinion improper, whatever correspondence or communication may have been received from the British government respecting the President's construction of the late treaty concluded at Washington, as it concerns an alledged right to *visit* American vessels, has the honor to inform the President that Mr. Fox, her Britannic majesty's envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, came to the department of State on the 24th of February instant, and informed the Secretary of State that he had received from Lord Aberdeen, her majesty's principal secretary of State for foreign affairs, a despatch under date of the 18th of January, which he was directed to read to the Secretary of State of the United States. The substance of that despatch was, that there was a statement in a paragraph of the President's message to Congress at the opening of the present session, of serious import, because, to persons unacquainted with the facts, it would tend to convey the supposition, not only that the question of right of search had been disavowed by the plenipotentiary at Washington, but that Great Britain had made concession on that point.

That the President knew that *the right of search never formed the subject of discussion during the late negotiation*, and that neither was any concession required by the United States government, nor made by Great Britain.

That the engagement entered into by the parties to the treaty of Washington for suppressing the African slave trade, was unconditionally proposed and agreed to.

That the British government saw in it an attempt, on the part of the government of the United States, to give a practical effect to their repeated declarations against the trade, and recognized, with satisfaction, an advance towards the humane and enlightened policy of all Christian States from which they anticipated much good. That Great Britain would scrupulously fulfill the conditions of this engagement; but that, from the principles which she has constantly asserted, and which are recorded in the correspondence between the ministers of the United States, in England, and himself, in 1841, England has not receded, and would not recede. That he had no intention to renew, at present, the discussion upon the subject. That his last note was yet unanswered. That the President might be assured that Great Britain would always respect the just claims of the United States. That Great Britain made no pretensions to interfere, in any manner whatever, either by detention, visit, or search with vessels of the United States, *known or believed to be such!* But that it still maintained, and would exercise, when necessary, its own right to ascertain the genuineness of any flag which a suspected vessel might bear; that if the exercise of this right, either from involuntary error, or in spite of every precaution, loss or injury should be sustained, a prompt reparation would be afforded. But that it should entertain, for a single instant, the notion of abandoning the right itself, would be quite impossible!

That these observations had been rendered necessary, by the message to Congress. That the President is undoubtedly at liberty to address that assembly in any terms which he may think proper; but if the queen's servants should not deem it expedient to advise her majesty also to advert to these topics in her speech from the throne, they desired, nevertheless, to hold themselves perfectly free when questioned in parliament, to give all such explanations as they might feel to be consistent with their duty, and necessary for the elucidation of the truth.

The paper having been read, and its contents understood, Mr. Fox was told, in reply, that the subject would be taken into consideration, and that a despatch relative to it would be sent, at an early day, to the American minister in London, who would have instructions to read it to her majesty's principal secretary of State for foreign affairs.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

SPEECH OF SIR ROBERT PEEL, ON THE ASHBURTON TREATY.

After expatiating on the valuable services of Lord Ashburton, and the excellences of his treaty, the honorable baronet said:

I think I shall be able to show, if the policy pursued by my noble friend should be questioned in this place, as it has been out of doors, that the treaty which he negotiated on the part of her majesty, with the United States, does give us that guaranty for the security and repose of our North American colonies which have been so long disturbed; and that although we have not obtained, under its provisions, all that we deemed ourselves entitled to, yet that, considering the uncertainty in which the expressions used in the original treaty left the boundary question, and also, not forgetting the insufficient degree of geographical knowledge which existed when the line of demarcation was first laid down upon the map—considering, I say, all these matters, I am of opinion that the adjustment which was come to by the present treaty, and the award of one-half of the disputed territory to us, and of the other half to the United States, we preserving a military line of communication with our settlements in that quarter, was a far better arrangement, and far more to the interests of this country, than the settlement which would have been come to under the award of the king of the Netherlands, to which this country had given her assent—(hear, hear.) And ,considering that the ceded territory was then in the occupation of the citizens of the United States, and that in 1839, a collision had almost taken place between the respective borderers with respect to the disputed right of occupation, I really do think I can show, if I should be hereafter called upon to do so, that we have acted in strict conformity to the honor and interest of Great Britain in ratifying the treaty by which this result has been brought about—(hear, hear.) In America, as here, there are parties who have been trying to obstruct and interrupt, as much as possible, the amicable relations of the two countries; and it is notorious, that Mr. Webster, because he receded from the extreme pretensions advanced by the United States,—pretensions, be it observed, which were then urged to the whole of the disputed territory, as was the case in this country,—this enlightened statesman, I repeat, has been taunted with having sold the interests of his country, and the same treaty which is styled by certain parties here the Ashburton capitulation, goes by the name of the Webster capitulation among many classes in the United States; a fact which, in my opinion, tends to prove that this adjustment of the difference is perfectly compatible with the dignity and honor of each country, and that two people, springing from one common origin, and having one language in common between them, have now no longer to deplore the likelihood of a rupture upon a question so entirely beside their mutual interests—(hear, hear.)

The right honorable gentleman has also afforded me an opportunity to explain the sentiments of government on that part of the President's late message which refers to a question of the highest importance to all civilized nations; and when I take into consideration the great importance of preserving harmony between the two countries, I must say it pains me exceedingly, when speaking of the message, to be compelled to observe, that I wish I could say it takes a fair view of the question relative to the right of search. But I cannot adopt this course. I am obliged, reluctantly, to state that the right of search is not put upon an equitable or reasonable footing in that document; and I must here observe that I am disposed to confirm, to the fullest extent, the doctrine laid down by the right honorable gentleman, the member for Halifax, that no two questions can be more distinct from each other than the right of *visit* and the right of *search*—(hear, hear.)

The right of search is a belligerant right, and if it is ever exercised during a period of peace it must be conceded under a distinct treaty. But the right of visit is quite another question, and it is a practice often enforced. The right of search, with respect to American vessels, we utterly disclaim to have any pretensions to exercise. By this I mean, that if we know, and are perfectly assured, that a vessel sailing under the American flag is *bona fide* American property, and manned and commanded by American seamen, we in no case have the smallest pretension to question or to interfere with her. Nay, more; I regret to say that, if we were perfectly cognizant of such vessel being fitted out with all the horrible apparatus requisite for the conveyance of slaves—if we knew that the manacles and other dreadful engines of coercion and torture were contained in that vessel—if we knew that her decks were constructed with the barbarous ingenuity that is customary to enable such traders to convey a closely packed cargo of human beings from Africa to the United States—did we, I repeat, possess undoubted and minute information on these heads, we should permit such a vessel to pass unquestioned and unvisited, provided we were satisfactorily convinced that the capital invested in her was American, and that her commander and crew were also of that nation. But the right which we do claim is to search whether the flag which is raised as a protection to a vessel does really cover an American ship, and our sole object in exercising that power is to ascertain and convince ourselves that the American flag, which such a vessel carries, is hers of right, and not merely hoisted to protect an illegal and barbarous traffic.

And therefore, sir, it is my duty in the face of the house of commons, expressing deep regret that there should appear to be any difference of understanding upon this topic, explicitly to declare that we have not waived one of the principles contended for by my noble friend, in the despatch of December, 1842.—Nay, more, it is my duty to declare that that dispatch has remained to the present hour unanswered. And I think I know too well what is the ability, what is the keenness of a Secretary of State of the United States, if doctrines so important as these could be questioned—I say, I know too well what is the ability of a Secretary of State in America to believe that that despatch would be now permitted to remain fourteen months unanswered and unacknowledged, if it was thought wise to contest it—(hear, hear.)

And, sir, with respect to the right of search, to that not belligerent right, but that conventional right—that right which is ceded by one power, for the purposes of humanity, to check this traffic in slaves—I am bound to say that even upon that point I am surprised at the determination with which the United States refused that mutual right—(hear, hear.) I am now speaking of that right of search which, by the treaties with France and the other great powers of Europe, a right is mutually conceded to parties desiring to prevent effectually the traffic in slaves, to search vessels belonging to those countries which are parties to the treaties, which are carrying on the slave trade; because, in the year 1824, a convention was signed with this country, by Mr. Rush, the minister of the United States, almost at the instigation of America, professing the utmost desire to put an end to the slave trade; a convention was signed between Mr. Huskisson and Mr. Rush, which did mutually concede the right of search; that is to say, which did enable the vessels of war of the United States and of Great Britain, respectively, under certain restrictions, to exercise that very right of search against which such a clamor is now made in a neighboring country—(hear, hear.) And the treaty was rejected by the Senate in the United States, not on the ground of objection to the right of search, but because the right of search extended to the coast of America, and the United States objected to the right being exercised in the immediate neighborhood of their coasts.

The Senate of the United States omitted the coasts of America, and Mr. Canning refused to ratify the treaty in consequence of that omission; but if Mr. Canning would have allowed the coasts of America to be omited from that treaty, at this moment the conventional right of search would have existed in respect to the United States of America; and I hope that those who contend with so much eagerness in the Chamber of France against the maintenance of treaties formed in the pure spirit of humanity, and who quote the example of the United States, will refer to that convention, and see that the United States themselves were the first to promote that conventional right of search—(hear hear.) Surely there must be some misunderstanding upon this subject. But considering the importance of this right, particularly to England—considering that we are contending for a right which is only a security against fraud, against the grossest abuses, under the flags of other powers, who are the advocates of a principle which is necessary for the security of all nations—I do state, in the face of the house of commons, that the right of visitation contended for in the despatch of my Lord Aberdeen, was not the subject of controversy; that we made no concession whatever upon it, and that the principles laid down in the despatch of Lord Aberdeen we adhere to at this moment—(loud cheers.)

With respect to the treaty which we have signed with the United States—in signing that treaty, we consider that we have abandoned no right of visitation. We did not understand from the United States that they entered into that treaty with any requisition from us to abandon the right of visitation, which is not necessarily connected with the question of slavery. We thought that it was a step in advance, when the United States professed to detach a naval force to the coast of Africa for the purpose of suppressing the slave trade. Although we did not consider the detachment of that naval force as equivalent for any right we claimed, yet still we thought for a great country like the United States to take that step, although the power of visitation is limited under that treaty in each case; although we claimed no new right to visit *bona fide* American slavers, and that right has been exercised by vessels of the United States—yet still we thought that it was a step in advance toward the ultimate suppression of the slave trade, to accede to the proposition of Mr. Webster; but in acceding to it, we have not abandoned in the slightest degree, nor, as we understand, was it ever brought into controversy that we should abandon, the right which was claimed in the despatch of my Lord Aberdeen. But since the appearance of the President's message, we have taken the opportunity to intimate to the United States the construction which we placed upon what passed on that occasion. (hear, hear.) And I trust that, although compelled to avow my material difference of opinion on this particular question, I have stated that difference of opinion with the respect I wish to pay toward the high authorities of the United States.

CLAY AND BOLIVAR.

We suppose some of our readers remember the correspondence that took place between Clay and Bolivar, in 1828. On the part of the latter, it was a letter expressive of thanks to Henry Clay for his efforts in the cause of South American liberty, and complimenting him on his great talents &c. The answer of Mr. Clay contained a solemn admonition to Bolivar, to beware of ambition, trifling with the liberties of the human race, and so on. We give a passage from it.

"I cannot allow myself to believe that your excellency will abandon the bright and glorious path which lies plainly before you, for the BLOODY ROAD PASSING OVER THE LIBERTIES OF THE HUMAN RACE, AND WHICH THE VULGAR CROWD OF TYRANTS AND MILITARY DESPOTS HAVE SO OFTEN TRODDEN."

Considerably sublime for a man who had made a road over the necks of fifty of his fellow-beings, and was daily travelling it! Contrast this with Mr. Clay's language to Mendenhall, in Indiana, who petitioned him to liberate his slaves. Mr. Clay remarked, that "his negroes were as well shod, as well clad, as sleek, and as fat, and (pointing his finger significantly at the subject of his address,) he believed they were as honest as he, or any of his associates in the petition." "He had about fifty slaves, of the aggregate value of about fifteen thousand dollars."

In the light of this fact, how edifying his admonition to Bolivar.—*Philanthropist.*

Communications.

LETTER TO RACHEL BARKER.

Sibsbam, Feb. 14, 1843.

The following letter was written to Rachel Barker, after having heard her preach a sermon at Peru, N. Y. in which she labored mainly to build up her peculiar sect, and to dissuade Friends from engaging in anti-slavery efforts, with abolitionists. The cool contempt with which she is reported to have disposed of the letter, and the fact that the letter itself contains some sentiments of general importance, furnish the reasons for requesting its publication. I have pruned somewhat, of its original verbiage; but its import remains unaltered:

Gouverneur, Aug. 27, 1842.

Dear Friend,—I lately became acquainted with your views on the anti-slavery movement, through your public communications while at Peru. The burden of your ministrations seemed to be, to dissuade Friends from engaging in the general efforts being put forth, for the emancipation of every slave throughout the world. The reasons urged for your opinions, appeared to me altogether insufficient for their full and just substantiation.

1. Your objections to Friends participating in these matters were, that doing so, would be "going into the mixture," "disturbing the quiet," and encouraging a "hireling priesthood." I am pained to discover, in the first objection, a strong manifestation of sectarianism, a practical denial of human brotherhood, and an assertion, by implication, of the partial regard of our common Father, for a particular sect, or organization. If all men are indeed our brethren, why not associate with them? especially in labors of philanthropy, and universal love! I am sure our Heavenly Father has no communion with a spirit that builds party walls to sunder human hearts, "which had else, like kindred drops, been mingled into one." The Divine blessing is not poured upon the race, by a partial respect to their sectarian organizations. It is not hemmed in, by geographical lines, or national boundaries. None but those who fear God, and work righteousness, are accepted of Him. All who do these are accepted, whether they belong to a sect or not. They constitute the Church of the First-born. Friends have always denied that any human organization could be the Church of Christ; but they refuse to co-operate with others, on the ground of a different religious faith, in benevolent efforts for the relief of human suffering. Is this less, in fact, than assuming to be *the* Church of Christ?

But I suppose you are ready to admit that the Lord has a chosen seed among all nations, kindreds, tongues, and people; and also, that there are many *Friends who hold the truth in unrighteousness.* Now, you are willing the Friends should undertake benevolent enterprises in a *sectarian* capacity, in which the corrupt portions of the members, as a matter of right and privilege, would participate in the consultations and acts thereof. At the same time, you refuse to co-operate with the *chosen* seed, because it is not found in your own society. I am at a loss to know why the ungodly are the better for being members of the Society of Friends; and especially, why they are preferred, as co-laborers, to the actually righteous of other denominations.

Again; I don't know as you are opposed to Friends entering into commercial pursuits with persons of every creed. But if so, then, in consistency, it ought to extend to an interdiction of social intercourse with all such people as differ with you in religious speculations. Your society would then stand on the same ground, in respect to other sects, as do the Jews and Mussulmen in regard to Christianity. It might be well to inquire, whether the principle, carried out, would not even prohibit your *preaching* to them. If it be said that these associations are of a *secular*, and not of a *religious* character, and that therefore the objection does not lie against entering into them, I object to the distinction. Secular duties cannot be distinct from religious duties. Every relation, duty, and office of a moral agent is, and must be, of a religious character; and rightly fulfilled and discharged, are as acceptable worship as prayer or exhortation. *All* should be done to the glory of God, whether we eat or drink. If anything forbids our entering into any association, it must be the nature of the association itself. The spirit which would limit Friends to the narrow bounds of their own sect, is far from the acknowledgment of human brotherhood. It looks as though those who indulge it, are chiefly concerned to enforce reverence for the discipline and "order of their society."

2. The injunction to keep in the quiet, is ambiguous. It may enjoin a course of conduct which will not create excitement, and call forth opposition. It may also be understood as inculcating the duty of suspending the rational powers of the soul, and looking, meanwhile, for some supernatural, mental illumination. Or it may be understood as enforcing the doctrines of the two preceding propositions. Whichever construction we assume, as the one intended to be given, they each and all appear to me to be erroneous.

But I understand you as objecting to anti-slavery measures, because they create excitement. You say that the truth does not create excitement, but leads into quietness. Yet so true is it, that it will cause excitement, that the apostles were accused of "turning the world upside down;" and they themselves testified, that he who would live godly in Christ Jesus, should suffer persecution. In view of this test of godliness, what persecution, I ask, are Friends meeting from the world? Have they not become aristocratic, and therefore respectable, in the world's estimation? Are they not honored by the world? Will not the world love its own? Are they not united with the world, in opposing the march of practical righteousness.* The fact that, in a country so full of murder and oppression as this, the Society of Friends creates no excitement, meets no persecution, is to me the highest evidence that it has become partaker of the nation's crimes. Therefore, the fact that abolitionists are persecuted, is evidence of the righteousness of their principles and conduct.

The idea prevalent among Friends, that in cases where duty is plain, or may be determined by exercising those rational powers with which we have been divinely endowed, we must wait for some supernatural manifestation of it, has been ruinous and fatal. In most instances, duty is obvious at first view. Those divine aids which we graciously receive, do not act independently of the exercise of our rational powers, nor in opposition to them. The dictates of reason are as much revelations of the divine will, as any other form of inspiration. To refuse obedience to its dictates, or to wait for a voice from God, out of the deep chambers of the blue heavens, bidding us follow those dictates, would be to tempt the Holy One. On this very point, the fiery-lipped prophet of old, declared, "Yea, the stork in the heavens knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle and the crane, and the swallow, observe the time of their coming; but my people doth not know the judgment of the Lord." When tempests deform the serene skies, and lightnings glare through them, and awful thunders lift up their voices, bird and beast understand them, as the voice of God, warning them to find covert from the tempest. They accordingly take to the woods, cleft rocks, and caverns. When the storm has poured out its fury, and the sun comes out, amid broken clouds, sending his rays, glittering among myriad rain-drops, on leaf and flower; this is again the voice of God, welcoming them back to a newly-spread banquet of pleasure. When autumn scowls, they understand it as a warning to seek burrows and warmer climes. And when spring smiles again in young beauty, and comes dancing to the music of prattling rills, breezes, and dashing waters; these, to them, are invitations back to their old haunts. Why is man more stupid than they? Were I to see a man, wounded and faint, by the way-side, must I endeavor to "get into the quiet," in order to know whether it were duty to help him from the dust, and to pour healing upon his wounds? The fact that I behold suffering—that my sympathies are pained—that I have the power of relieving—are so many of heaven's direct commands, to succor the distressed. Why else have we reason? Why those strong sympathies to feel another's woes, and to impel their relief? But then you think it is "*womanish*" to be influenced by "*sympathy.*" Yet it appears to me, that an All-wise Father has given us the power of sympathising for a noble purpose; and that it were wise in us, not to despise the gift. Suppose I were to see your daughter weltering in fire, and, putting sympathy aside, should sit me down, coolly to philosophize, whether it were best to take her from the broiling coals. Would this be *manly?* And would it be "*womanish*" to snatch her from the fire, under the strong impulse of excited benevolence or *sympathy?* I think your own *womanhood*, under such circumstances, would put your *philosophy* to shame.

If the dogma, that a propagation of truth produces no excitement, be false, and if it be a false notion that we are not to use our rational powers, in the discovery of truth and duty, then a union of the two would be a combination of errors; therefore, the third construction of your exhortation, to get into the quiet, also proves the exhortation to be absurd.

3. The last objection which I shall notice is, that abolitionists countenance a hireling priesthood. This is indeed a singular objection, coming, as it does, from Friends. In what way does it appear, they are supporting a hireling ministry? Is it because the self-denying agents receive their necessary food and clothing, while devoting their whole time and energies to the cause? Then are many indigent ministers among Friends hirelings; for it often happens, that they are assisted, in this way, in the discharge of what they deem religious duties. But there are those, who get nothing but contumely and scorn for their labors in behalf of the slave, beside the approval of a good conscience—the necessary reward of benevolent labors. But the taking of money as a lecturer, does not constitute a "*hireling.*" "The laborer is worthy of his hire." He who conceals truth through fear of losing his salary—who will not plead the cause of the poor and needy *unless* paid for it, —who suppresses the truth for fear of reproach, is a hireling. While all the proud, pharisaical religionists and priests are stopping their ears to the cry of the slave—while Friends are living in aristocratic luxury, buying and selling for their own selfish ends, the abolitionists are offering property, personal security, and life, a willing sacrifice, for the redemption of the slave; while the high-priests of all the sects give their voices against them.

Friends once bore a noble testimony against a hireling clergy. Their boldness drew down persecution upon their heads. But those are by-gone days, and Friends are in honor with the priests. Whom does a hireling priesthood dread more than all other men? The anti-slavery movements have done more than all things else, in the land, to expose the corruptions of the priesthood, and the falseness of their religion. But where do we find Friends? Herod and Pilate have become friends. Instead of arraying themselves with abolitionists, in exposing the temporising of the priests in regard to their duties to the slave, Friends are united hand in hand with the priests, in opposing abolitionists. They honor the memories of Benezet and Woolman, and at the same time draw down the axe of excommunication upon the necks of their members, for doing what those worthies did.* Who are witnessing against the awful destruction of human life by the hand of man—once regarded as one of your most important testimonies? Many of these same abolitionists.

I have no doubt the days of your society are numbered. Its tendency is to promote sectarianism, and "to maintain the order of society," rather than to advance truth, and human reformation.

Friends can exhort one another to "keep in the quiet," "to keep out of the mixture," to keep up their meetings; but dissuade one another from practically remembering those in bonds as bound with them. I am persuaded that a great part of their meeting-going is as offensive to Him who is all-righteous, as were the burnt offerings and sacrifices of the Jews. "To what purpose are the multitude of your sacrifices unto me?" saith the Lord. "I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts. I delight not in the blood of bullocks; or of lambs; or of he-goats. Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me: the new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies I cannot away with: it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well; seek judgment; relieve the oppressed; judge the fatherless; plead for the widow." Would that Friends "searched out the cause they knew not."

I have endeavored to speak as the circumstances demanded; plainly, but kindly.

Respectfully, your friend, JOHN ORVIS.

* Bear in mind the disownment of Hopper, Marriott, and Gibbons, by the New-York Yearly meeting.

CONVENTION IN CHESTER COUNTY, Pa.

A large and respectable meeting of the citizens of the county of Chester, was convened in the Marlborough meeting-house, on the 4th day of February, A. D. 1843, pursuant to a public call, by direction of the board of managers of the Chester County Anti-Slavery Society; and continued, by adjournment, the succeeding day, at Kennett Square. Chandler Darlington was called to the chair, and Isaac Martin, and Simpson Preston, appointed secretaries.

The following preamble and resolutions were adopted by the meeting—viz:

Whereas, by the construction of the federal Constitution, now established by the Supreme Court of the United States, an inhabitant of a slave State has legal authority to seize his absconding slave wherever he may find him in the free States, and carry him whithersoever he may choose, without any legal process whatever; and the free States are denied the power and authority to require him to resort to any such process, or to make any proof, or even allegation of the fact, that the person seized is his legal property; which state of things exposes many free persons to imminent danger of being seized and carried away into hopeless bondage, and calls loudly upon the free States to exercise all the powers which they yet possess to protect their citizens from such outrageous wrongs;—and whereas, the existing laws of this commonwealth in relation to this subject have been framed to conform to a different construction of the Constitution, and are now rendered nearly inoperative and void; therefore,

Resolved, That the legislature of this State be earnestly requested to make a careful revision of the laws in relation to kidnapping, with a view to extend such protection as we yet may to our free population, and to confine the man-hunter strictly within the limits of his legal powers.

Resolved, That slavery being at variance with right and justice, and inimical to the best interests of our country; those parts of the Constitution and laws which support or recognize its existence, should be confined to a *strict* construction; and all doubts or uncertainties in relation to their meaning and application, should be construed in favor of liberty, and the equal rights of man.

Resolved, That all officers of the State government should be prohibited from taking cognizance of the case of fugitive slaves, under the laws of Congress; or rendering any assistance, in their official capacity, to the detention of such fugitives.

Resolved, That the officers of this convention be instructed to forward a copy of the foregoing preamble and resolutions to the legislature of this State, at Harrisburg.

The following were adopted at the session held at Kennett Square; viz:

Resolved, That although the pecuniary interests of the people of the North have been sacrificed on the altar of slavery, and the rights guarantied them by the national Constitution shamelessly violated, in order to give permanency to the system, yet it is not because of these things only, that we feel bound to maintain our testimony against it; but because of its inherent sinfulness, its continual and necessary violation of the principles of truth.

Resolved, That the people of the North are more especially bound to labor for its overthrow, inasmuch as they now sustain it; by causing the general government to sanction its abominations; by pledging their physical power for its support; by giving their social and religious influence to uphold it; and by paying the slave-holder a premium for oppression, in the purchase of goods obtained by the labor of slaves.

Resolved, That when this convention adjourns, it adjourn to meet at West Chester, sometime in the fifth or sixth month next; and that the committee, who have had the care in relation to this convention, be requested to make the necessary arrangements, and fix the particular day for that meeting.

CHANDLER DARLINGTON, *President.*

Isaac Martin, Simpson Preston, } *Secretaries.*

* Witness their fondness for Henry Clay, whose soul is stained with duelling and slavery. Mark his compliment to them! Mark the Baltimore epistle or circular, and the panegyrics of southern papers upon the society. Note recent movements in Indiana.

The Anti-Slavery Standard.

NEW-YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1843.

TREATMENT OF THE INSANE.

By the kind attention of F. W. Holland, I lately received a Memorial to the Massachusetts Legislature, on the treatment of the insane. In the signer, Dorothea L. Dix, I recognized a valued and highly respected friend of former years; and my heart gave her cordial greeting in the great and good work she has undertaken. Knowing her fastidious propriety, and almost excessive reserve of character, I can well appreciate the effort it cost her to appear before the public, on a subject so painful and disgusting in its details. She herself thus alludes to the sacrifice, with unpretending conciseness: "Surrendering to calm and deep convictions of duty my habitual views of what is womanly and becoming, I proceed briefly to explain what has conducted me before you, unsolicited and unsustained; trusting, while I do so, that the memorialist will be speedily forgotten in the memorial."

This is *true* delicacy. That is a spurious modesty, which considers the preservation of its own dignity of more consequence than the amelioration of human suffering. Some squeamish, selfish, and vain doll of fashion, may say, "How *could* a woman publish such indelicate details!" Thou foolish plaything! when sickness and suffering overtake thyself, wilt thou not be thankful to whoever traces thy disease through all its loathsome details, and so brings to thee relief? Hast thou a woman's heart, and wilt thou let the poor and the forsaken suffer a lingering death, because it is indelicate to describe their situation? Look on the world with vision made clearer by the renunciation of thyself, and thou wilt be thankful to the universal Father, that the day has come when "there is nothing hid that shall not be revealed;" when the blind find the eyes of others willing to look out for them, and the dumb find other tongues than their own to proclaim their hidden wrongs.

D. L. Dix appears to have entered upon this work of benevolence with the spirit of Mrs. Fry; may her labors be as eminently blessed. The memorial shows too painfully how much the forlorn objects of her pity have *need* of a friend to plead their cause. She calls the attention of the legislature to the present condition of insane persons in Massachusetts, "confined in *cages, closets, cellars, stalls*, and *pens. Chained, naked, beaten with rods*, and *lashed into obedience!*" To prove her assertions, she briefly narrates what she has herself witnessed, in a tour through the commonwealth, to examine into the condition and treatment of the insane. We give the following extracts from her memorial:

"*Fitchburg.* In November, visited the alms-house—inquired the number of insane—was answered, several; but two in close confinement; one idiotic subject. Saw an insane person in a dreary, neglected apartment, unemployed, and alone. Idleness and solitude weaken, it is said, the sane mind, much more must it hasten the downfall of that which is already trembling at the foundations. From this apartment I was conducted to an out-building, a portion of which was inclosed, so as to unite shelter, confinement, and solitude. The first space was a sort of entry, in which was a window; beyond, a close partition with doors, indicated where was the insane man I had wished to see. He had been returned from the hospital as incurable. I asked if he was violent, or dangerous? 'No.' Is he clothed? 'Yes.' Why keep him shut in this close confinement? 'O, my husband is afraid he'll run away, then the overseers won't like it; he'll get to Worcester, and then *the town will have money to pay.*' 'He must come out—I wish to see him.' The opened door disclosed a squalid place, dark, and *furnished* with straw. The crazy man raised himself slowly from the floor upon which he was crouched; and with unsteady steps came towards me. His look was feeble and sad, but calm and gentle.

'Give me those books, oh give me, those books!' and with trembling eagerness he reached for some books I carried in my hand. 'Do give them to me, I want them,' said he, with kindling earnestness. You could not use them, friend; you cannot see here. 'O, give them to me, do;' and he raised his hand, and bent a little forward, lowering his voice—'*I'll pick a little hole in the plank, and let in some of God's light.*'

The master came round. 'Why cannot you take this man abroad to work on the farm? he is harmless; air and exercise will help to recover him.' The answer was in substance the same as that first given; but he added, 'I've been talking with our overseers, and I've proposed getting from the blacksmith an iron collar and chain; then I can have him out by the house.' An iron collar and chain! 'Yes; I had a cousin up in Vermont, crazy as a wildcat, and I got a collar made for him, *and he liked it.*' Liked it! how did he manifest his pleasure? 'Why, he left off trying to run away. I kept the alms-house at Groton; there was a man there from the hospital; I built an outhouse for him, and the blacksmith made him an iron collar and chain; so we made him fast; and the overseers approved it, and—' I here interrupted him. I have seen that poor creature at Groton, in his doubly

by locks was she imprisoned in these confined limits? For whom? In another part of the cellar were other small closets, only better, because higher through the entire length, into one of which she by turns was transferred, so as to afford opportunity for fresh whitewashing, &c.

Some may say these things cannot be remedied; these furious maniacs are not to be raised from these base conditions. I *know* they are; could give *many* examples; let *one* suffice. A young woman, a pauper, in a distant town, *Sandisfield*, was for years a raging maniac. A cage, chains, and the *whip*, were the agents for controlling her, united with harsh tones and profane language. Annually, with others, (the town's poor,) she was put up at auction, and bid off at the lowest price which was declared for her. One year, not long past, an old man came forward in the number of applicants for the poor wretch; he was taunted and ridiculed; 'What would he and his old friend do with such a mere beast?' 'My wife says yes,' replied he; 'and I shall take her.' She was given to his charge; he conveyed her home; she was washed, neatly dressed, and placed in a decent bed-room, furnished for comfort, and opening into the kitchen. How altered her condition! As yet the *chains* were not off. The first week, she was somewhat restless, at times violent; but the quiet, kind ways of the old people, wrought a change; she received her food decently, forsook acts of violence, and no longer uttered blasphemous or indecent language; after a week, the chain was lengthened, and she was received as a companion into the kitchen. Soon she engaged in trivial employments. 'After a fortnight,' said the old man, 'I knocked off the chains, and made her a free woman.' She is at times excited, but not violently; they are careful of her diet; they keep her very clean; she calls them 'father' and 'mother.' Go there now, and you will find her 'clothed,' and though not perfectly in her 'right mind,' so far restored as to be a safe and comfortable inmate."

These are terrible facts; but their existence, so far from being peculiar to Massachusetts, pervades the world.—They probably exist in New England in forms less painful than most other countries. The difficulty does not lie so much in want of kindness, as in want of thought, and deficiency of knowledge. Men have gone on for two thousand years, blindly, but most diligently, striving to fasten down evil with *chains*, or to drive it out with *scourges*; and even now, it is the hardest of all achievements to convince them that such instrumentalities always increase the mischief, and *never* cure it. They are contrary to religion, contrary to reason, at war with all our good instincts, and in direct violation of the laws by which the constitution of man is governed. Why do we continue thus to tumble along, so carelessly blind to our highest interests and most sacred duties? It is because we have not *faith* in principles. We ask for *facts* to prove that the Law of Love is omnipotent to overcome evil. Such facts are comparatively rare, because few trust sufficiently to the holy principle, which produces them; but where faith exists, it has *never*, in one solitary instance, failed to work miracles in the name of Jesus. The wild Indian, the raving maniac, the desperate robber, have always yielded to it, wherever there has been time and opportunity to make them understand that *love*, not *cowardice*, was the ruling principle. Everybody knows what blessed results have flowed from the application of patient and judicious kindness to the treatment of the insane, in many large establishments at the present day. It is a shame to humanity, and a disgrace to civilization, that *every* sufferer of this class is not provided with a permanent home, as cheerful and happy as their diseased condition admits of. The best medical skill, the kindest and most discreet of nurses, should be employed; and all the light that can be gathered from all science, all experience, and all theory, should be applied to each individual case, with watchful, patient, and judicious tenderness. None but cheerful faces and affectionate voices should be allowed to come near these ruined human temples. They should be encircled continually with human love. When friends and relatives are too poor to incur the expense of providing such a home, the town or the State should do it. But "*the town would have money to pay*," says the objector. "They made themselves crazy by their own tempers, or their vices," says another; "and God has punished them. Shall we undertake to be more just than God?"

Oh! blessed Jesus! is it two thousand years since thy words of mercy and forgiveness have been falling on the human heart, like heavenly dew, to produce no better result than this? The Sermon on the Mount has gone forth to the ends of the earth, and still men can perceive no wiser use of government than to *punish*; no better use of a human soul than to *save money* by its utter desolation!

Moreover, it is untrue that insanity is generally produced by the vices and crimes of its victims. Society, by its selfish spirit, its fluctuating standard of right, its false forms, and its bad excitements, is mainly answerable for insanity and crime. A gloomy theology, terrific appeals to superstitious ignorance, the fluctuations of currency and trade, the necessity of deferring marriage till late in life, by reason of the expensive modes of living, and the unprincipled competition in business, which makes it so difficult to support a family—these are the chief causes of insanity. Society takes away the genial and healthy influence of well employed faculties and affections, and leaves feverish anxiety and excitement in their stead.

Disease, sometimes hereditary, sometimes occasioned by sudden accidents, or injudicious modes of living, is likewise a fruitful source of insanity. I have often heard Isaac T. Hopper speak of a nephew of his, a very promising young man, remarkable for strong attachment to his family connexions. He surprised them all one day, by a proposition to leave them, and settle in the southern States. Not long after, an increasing indifference to his connexions was very observable, which finally took the form of open aversion, particularly toward his father, to whom he had always been peculiarly attached. It was, however, a long time before they suspected insanity was the cause of his altered character. But at last, he became incoherent, wild, and violent, and was put into an insane hospital, where he remained until he died. After his death, a deep hollow was discovered in the back of his scull, the cause of which was unknown. If phrenology had been talked of in those days, this singular cavity in the region of the domestic affections would no doubt have been brought forward as strong circumstantial evidence of the truth of that science. In fact, George Combe mentions a similar instance, in his lectures. A gentleman died, who had been remarkable for the strength of his family attachments, but who had latterly neglected his connexions, and was with difficulty induced to mention them in his will. The physician said he died of a lung complaint; but his brother, who was a phrenologist, expressed a strong desire to have his head examined; they did so, and to their surprise found twenty-seven abscesses in the back part of the head.

Phrenology has suffered more than most theories, from rash and superficial thinkers; but after all the dross is removed, I think enough of genuine truth will remain to throw great light on the management of hospitals, asylums, &c. Nor may animal magnetism be useless in these establishments, by calling into activity the faculties most opposed to those which are in an unnatural state of restless energy.

Few things are more likely to make a well man crazy, than want of employment; and to this dreadful state of vacuity the insane are almost universally given over. When D. L. Child was in England, he visited an insane asylum conducted on principles of love, as many now are. There was to be a Fair in the neighborhood for the benefit of the blind, and the inmates of the asylum were invited to work for it. The proposal made them as happy as children. They were overjoyed at being trusted, and were equally eager to manifest their ingenuity and their benevolence. Abundant materials were given them, some of which were of course spoiled by grotesque manufacture; but they made a great many very tasteful and pretty articles. One woman, who was very crazy, embroidered a harp and heart on a very neat pincushion, with the motto, "I give thee all; my harp and heart;" and all the while she was making it, she was as cheerful as a bird. This asylum was famed for curing even desperate cases of insanity.

At the Vermont Insane Asylum, the inmates publish a weekly Journal, devoted to the dissemination of correct views of the condition and proper treatment of the insane. The editor has been often under treatment for lunacy, and is therefore desirous of expressing his views concerning the best mode of treating it. They earnestly invite editors and publishers to exchange with them. "Did they know," say they, "the many weary hours their papers would beguile, and the relief and enjoyment that would be afforded to many suffering minds, they would feel amply compensated by the happiness they conferred."

There is certainly no deficiency of wit or sense in this Asylum Journal. A short time ago, they set up a "crazy man's ticket" for President and Vice President; saying, 'We have selected one from each of the great political parties of the day, believing that if we can unite the crazy ones of both parties, we shall most certainly elect our candidates. If we succeed, as we think we shall, no one need fear but that we shall be at least as well governed as for the last several years."

One of the women contributors thus manifests a moral perception much clearer than appertains to a majority of people out of the asylum:

"I believe that all the kingdoms of this world are opposed to the kingdom of Christ; and that our nation is more guilty than all others, because it is a greater hypocrite: professing to be the most free and enlightened nation on earth, and yet retaining millions of its subjects in slavery, 'the vilest that ever saw the sun.' I believe that the negro slave has as much right to freedom as I have; and upon that, the abolitionist is the only truly sane."

One of them tells the story of an old aunt of his, who loudly praised a rich man, for building a great brick meeting house. "Heaven prospered him in the undertaking," said she; "he has sold out; the underground part for victualing cellars, the basement story for grocery shops; and after selling the pews, he has nearly fifteen hundred dollars more than the whole cost him; and next week it is to be dedicated to the Lord."

"Now, we crazy ones think that churches should be built by benevolent and pious individuals, and then *unreservedly* dedicated to God, and opened to all who have a desire to worship in them. This building your churches like splendid palaces, making the pews the individual property of those who are able to buy them, and turning the button against all who are not owners, drives from those houses the poor, to whom the gospel was first preached freely, and for whose comfort and consolation it was emphatically sent."

I know not what effect the pleasant excitement of preparing this paper may have on the inmates of the Vermont asylum; but I should suppose it could not be otherwise than good, provided they keep out of theological and political squabbles—those snares of the evil one.—L. M. C.

WASHINGTON CORRESPONDENCE.

WASHINGTON, March 4, 1843.

Since my last, Mr. Adams has proposed four sets of resolutions, each of an interesting character. The first related to the annexation of Texas. As chairman of the committee on foreign affairs, he reported on the Alabama, resolutions in favor, and sundry remonstrances against the measure, that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the subject. As an individual member, he offered resolutions to the effect. 1st. That there is no power in this government to annex to this Union any foreign State; 2d. That any attempt to annex Texas, either by act of Congress, or treaty, would be a violation of the Constitution, null and void. and that the people of the free States ought not to submit to it. As soon as the resolutions were read, the South was on its legs, objecting loudly to the reception; and they were *not received*.

Another set related to *repudiation*. Mr. Adams had before expressed his views, briefly, that it was the duty of the United States to come to the aid and relief of the States, in some form, under their present embarrassments; and referring to a letter of the late Governor McNutt, of Mississippi, in which the belief is expressed, that foreign governments would enforce the claims of their citizens by war, and that Mississippi would go to war, sooner than pay her bonds,—Mr. Adams asked, What would the United States do, if it came to that? Would they see a State conquered? He inferred, that if it would be the duty of the general government to defend a repudiating State, in case of a war to enforce payment, it was now the duty of the same government to take measures to prevent the occurrence of such a contingency. Soon after these observations were made in the House, Mr. McDuffie offered, and supported, in the Senate, resolutions declaring that the government has no power to assume debts of States contracted for their own purposes. The resolutions which Mr. Adams now proposed were three: The *first* declares that for a State to repudiate a debt contracted by the authority of its legislature, is a violation of that provision of the Constitution, which prohibits the passing of "any law impairing the obligation of contracts." The *second* declares that if any State shall involve herself in a war with a foreign power, in consequence of repudiation, the government of the United States has no power to involve *them* in such war. The *third*, that a State involving herself in such a war will cease to be a State of this Union, and will have no right or claim to any aid from the United States. Before Mr. Adams offered these resolutions, Mr. Cost Johnson, of Maryland, had made a report, from a select committee, on his project for the relief of the States, which concluded with a resolution, that it is expedient to employ the credit of the United States for the relief of the States, to the extent of two hundred millions of dollars. Mr. Adams, who was on the same committee, offered his resolutions as a minority report, to be adopted in case the other was rejected; and he moved the printing of them. Mr. Wise attempted to exclude them, as not receivable; but the speaker ruled that they were. The question on Mr. Adams's motion, was decided in the negative—yeas 72, nays 108. These resolutions arrested strongly the attention of the House, and caused much sensation. Cost Johnson's report is ordered to be printed, and will probably furnish much interesting matter.

The resolutions of Mr. Adams are well timed, as a warning to southwestern and northwestern States, not to expect help, in the piratical affair of repudiation, from the northern States. I think that the doctrine of repudiation is gaining ground. The helpless territory of Florida has repudiated, by a nearly unanimous vote; and it seems to be expected that Indiana and Illinois will do so, too. Meantime, the two antagonist schemes of *repudiation* and of *assumption* are infusing themselves into the opposite parties; and by the time the country gets ready to enter earnestly upon the next election, will have acquired a paramount importance. Certain it is, that either general repudiation, or assumption by the general government, must come. The intimate relation which this government may have to State measures of this sort, is illustrated by certain occurrences after the war of the revolution. The State of Virginia passed a law repudiating, in substance, all debts owed by citizens of Virginia to British subjects. The debtors were not relieved from them, but were ordered to pay them into the treasury of the State. In respect to the British creditors, and to the State, it was repudiation. The British, when they saw this, refused to surrender the American forts all along the northern and northwestern line. The Supreme Federal Court decided that the act of Virginia was unconstitutional; the money was paid over, and the affair happily ended. It was, however, in consequence of this case, that the mischievous amendment was introduced into the Constitution, that no State should be made a party to a suit in favor of an individual of another State, or of a foreign country.

The third set of resolutions declared, that five of the judges of the Supreme Court ought to be appointed from the *free States*; the next chief justice from the same; and afterwards alternately from the free and slave States.

The fourth and last resolutions were offered late in the evening of the 3d of March; and the ordinary din of this riotous assembly was so increased by the admission of women into the members seats, (a very absurd thing, of which many deposed members complained bitterly, out of the hearing of the fair usurpers,) that I could not hear distinctly. The purport was, that any naval or military commander, who shall, without authority, make invasion or depredation upon any foreign nation, ought to be surrendered to the government of such nation, to be dealt with according to the laws thereof, in such cases made and provided. This proposition, of course, arose out of the late affair at Monterey. If we had enacted such a law at an early period of our history, it would have saved us from the greatest misfortune and disgrace that have ever befallen us as a people.

You will have observed, by speeches and votes which I have heretofore noticed, how faithfully Mr. Cushing has labored to qualify himself for his recent nomination, by a Virginia slaveholder, breeder, and trader, for the high office of Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Cushing possesses talents more than ordinarily fitted for the duties of that station. As to his *moral* fitness, I choose to leave him to the verdict of your readers, upon facts heretofore stated. Only three days ago, he made a fresh effort to enhance his claims upon Mr. Tyler, by appending, the following, quite gratuitously, to a speech on the British treaty:

"He had only this to add, before he took leave of the subject. On this, as on other occasions, the United States had ample cause to regret that they had, ever given in to *sentimental legislation*. The only debatable point in this whole matter was a question under the law of nations, which might arise on the *piracy* statute. We had taken a false step, when we gave a *false* name to the *slave trade*."

This was "saying ditto" to Mr. Calhoun. It was heard with evident delight by one part of the House, and with as evident disgust by another. But, as the Roman shoemaker said of his parrot, which he had taught to speak certain words, "it was all labor lost." Last evening, at about eleven o'clock, when the House of Representatives was crowded with a brilliant assemblage, and Mr. Cushing had made a speech, "in holyday and lady terms," recommending the unanimous adoption of a vote of thanks to the speaker, and that the separation should be marked by the manifestation of some but sentiments of kindness and generosity; and when the Senate were in secret session, and all were on the tiptoe of expectation, and some warmly congratulating Mr. Cushing on his nomination, and expressing entire confidence that "*he* would go;" and when Mr. Wise also had concluded a speech on the same subject of thanks, with the declaration that he *left* that House with none but the kindest feelings towards every member of it—lo! a whisper went round, as sudden as electricity, that *both were rejected*.

Various rumors are afloat as to the special causes of this result. It is said that Mr. Cushing was rejected by a vote of 24 to 20; and Wise, (as minister to France,) by a vote of 20 to 12. The President was at the capitol, and immediately repeated these nominations, which were again rejected; he then repeated them the *third time*, when there were but *two* votes in favor of Wise. Subsequently, John C. Spencer was nominated to the Treasury, and was confirmed, by a vote of 21 to 20. As to Wise, it is said that the objection was, that he was too impetuous to be entrusted with so important a foreign mission as that to France; and as to Cushing, that his famous speech, known as "the auction speech," was taken up and analyzed, and this question put to the Senate, "Will you sanction such principles in this government, by appointing the man who avows them, to preside over the *treasury*? There is another reason, which I think must have entered into the account. Both candidates had become distinguished as much by treachery to their friends, and to their principles, as by any other means; and they were now presented to receive, at the hands of those friends, who still value those principles, the most splendid rewards of public virtue, within the gift of the government. It is true, that the confirmation of W. W. Irwin, another member of the guard, as charge des affaires to Denmark, militates, apparently, against this supposition; but Irwin has been comparatively quiet and harmless. A jest was current in the House yesterday. It was supposed that Captain Tyler thought there *must be* something "rotten in Denmark."

Edward Everett is appointed on the new embassy to China. It is supposed that Mr. Webster and the captain (Ego et rex meus) intend the vacancy for himself. At all events, when it was urged, as an objection to Cushing, that there was already a head of department from Massachusetts, the chairman of the committee of foreign affairs, in the Senate, and Mr. Choate, of Massachusetts, declared that they were authorized to say, that "in ten days the department of State would be vacant." There were many minor appointments. One incident was highly creditable for these party times. A Mr. Smith, whig, was nominated for collector at Philadelphia, and *unanimously* rejected; and Mr. Bligh, democrat, and predecessor of Jonathan Roberts, was afterwards nominated, and immediately confirmed. Considering that a majority of the Senate are whigs, I look upon this as very remarkable. The President has signed the bill repealing the *Bankrupt act*.—D. L. C.

HENRY CLAY, GEN. SCOTT, AND THE SOUTH.

We extract the following from the Warrenton Flag, a Virginia paper. It is one of a thousand things to prove the extreme sensitiveness of the South on every subject that bears, however remotely, on slavery. The sentence in italics is indeed a precious admission from a *slaveholder*, and one who nominates *slaveholders* for office! The Virginians themselves declare that "*absolute sway*, and *implicit obedience*," do give a man "*notions of authority, incompatible with the principles of free government!*"

Here follows the bluster made because Gen. Scott stated to J. Q. Adams the simple fact, "I am not a slaveholder," when Mr. Adams had publicly said he was one:

"In a speech recently delivered by Mr. J. Q. Adams, he abused the southern people most bitterly, and denounced the Constitution of the United States for its concessions in regard to slavery. We had not supposed that any man who was attached to the salutary compromises and catholic doctrines on which the constitution was based, especially if a southern man, would have done aught to propitiate the favor of such a fanatic and incendiary; but we were mistaken, as appears by a letter of the same Mr. Adams, to be found in the National Intelligencer of the 6th inst., in which he says he has "*received a communication from Gen. Scott himself, informing him that he is not a slaveholder.*" This uncalled for declaration excites the surprise and regret of every southern man. Gen. Scott is by birth and education a Virginian; and being extensively connected by blood and affinity with slaveholders, and well acquainted, by a long residence among us, with the institution of slavery, loyalty to the South, and a just appreciation of her dignity, her rights, and her character, demanded of him, if he spoke at all, to denounce the wicked orator, his vile falsehoods and nefarious purposes. This was the course a patriot and rational philanthropist should have pursued. But it seems it would not have squared with the sentiments of the major general; and he is found encouraging British and American incendiaries in their unhallowed efforts to dissolve the Union, and drench our country in the blood of intestine war.

"We have had a high admiration of the military virtues of Gen. Scott; and Virginia, ever paternal in her regard for her children, has evinced her respect for him by the designation of a large portion of her territory by his name. But as a statesman, he is entitled to no consideration whatever; he can know nothing of the science of government. Attached for upwards of thirty years to the army, in which the *precepts of absolute sway and implicit obedience, are inculcated as the first of virtues, his notions of authority and personal habitudes are incompatible in an eminent degree with the principles of free government and the usages of civil administration.* Holding the sentiments which his "disclaimer" discloses; accustomed to imperious authority over his obedient battalions for a period much longer than the common term of life, he is among the last whom we would invest with the power and influence of chief magistrate.

"If we are to have a whig president, we trust he may not be a southern man, who, when his kindred and countrymen are denounced by every epithet which can add enormity to crime, acquiesced in its justice by a personal exoneration of himself from all participation in the imputed offense. Mr. Adams arraigns the South before all Christendom as robbers, pirates, and monsters; and Gen. Scott, a native and citizen of that section, advancing in the arena, cries out to the accuser of his countrymen, *Don't include me in your anathemas*—'I AM NO SLAVEHOLDER!'"

The following remarks about HENRY CLAY, we copy from the Fredericksburg (Virginia,) Arena. It quotes the declaration of the Journal of Commerce, that the abolitionists throughout the North, are determined, by fair means or foul, to defeat Mr. Clay in the presidential election:

"Boys of the South, do you hear *that*? Should Henry Clay fail, no prouder, no more patriotic inscription could grace the tomb of his prospects than that he died in opposition to abolition. The watchword at the South should be—'Give us Clay, or give us political death.' All the signs of the times point out this course as wise. Let southern men consider the ravings of O'Connell, and other influential foreigners, about our peculiar institution—let them consider the constant influx of foreigners, thus prejudiced against us, and the activity of traitors at home, and say whether it does not behove the South to select a man to the office of President, who has wounded, and *whose capacity to wound abolition is greater now than that of any other distinguished man in the country?*—'Fair means or foul!!!' So important do abolitionists regard the necessity for prostrating the statesman of the West. As a southern man, as an American, we repeat, give us Clay, or give us political death."

THE RIGHT OF SEARCH.

We copy Sir Robert Peel's speech in parliament, which makes a marked distinction between the right to *visit* and the right to *search*; and the President's message, which, on the contrary, defines the right of visit and the right of search as identical. The Journal of Commerce says.

The discussions lately renewed on the 8th article of the Ashburton Treaty, seem to us to be a matter that the common sense of the people on both sides will settle sooner than diplomatists can. The treaty, in reality, does not discuss the question now renewed:—it simply establishes the fact, that the United States is to keep a squadron of 80 guns on the coast of Africa, to aid in the great cause of preventing an abuse of its flag to purposes of slave dealing. England does the same. And each government, it is presumed, will v e with the other in preventing crimes of every description on that coast, and to protect and further, as far as practicable, lawful trade, and lawful traders. Practically speaking, it is fair to presume, that in this praiseworthy pursuit,—taking into consideration the unhealthiness of the climate, the exposure of unarmed traders to the rapacity of the actual slaver, who would not hesitate to rob and plunder stores and supplies from any flag, and sink it into the bargain, to prevent detection,—these two squadrons of England and the United States, whose right of visit is *mutual*, would, for every offense *accidentally* committed, perform twenty acts of courtesy and kindness towards the lawful flag of their respective countries.

What then, is this new discussion about? Do we say that no matter how suspicious in appearance a vessel may be, our commanders are only to look at the *flag* and inquire no further? If so, we had better save our navy, and keep our vessels of war on some more useful service. It would be worse than nonsense to send 80 guns to the coast of Africa under such circumstances. What we would rightly claim to do, we should allow others to do; guarding as far as practicable against all abuses, and exacting or granting suitable indemnity should abuses occur.

The real difficulty is, our slave-breeding and slave-selling legislators are sensitive on the subject of the *foreign* slave trade. They see too close a resemblance between the trading on the coast of Africa, and their own trading on the coast of Virginia and Carolina; they feel instinctively that the arguments which overthrow one, will overthrow the other, and the public sentiment which withers one, will scorch the other also; hence the repeated avowals of southern statesmen in Congress that they "regret the slave trade was ever recognized as *piracy* by our national laws."

The denial of a right to *visit* a suspected vessel is the denial of a right acknowledged and practised by all nations. What is more common than for any armed vessel to chase a suspected pirate, fire across her path, and compel her to lay to, and show her papers?

LATIMER.

The legislature of Massachusetts have reported on the petition of George Latimer, and more than sixty-five thousand citizens of that Commonwealth. The report is drawn up with great ability; candid and courteous in its tone to all parties; respectful to the Constitution and the Supreme Court; but withal highly favorable to the prayer of the petitioners.

We make the following extract, intending to give the whole Report next week:

"Without, in the remotest degree, intending to recommend any steps of resistance to the execution of the clause of the Constitution which has been so liberally construed, so long as it shall remain a clause in that instrument, we do nevertheless feel the necessity of devising some method, strictly justifiable in itself, of restricting the scope of its operation. For your committee must insist, that in spite of all the restraining provisions of the Constitution, it would be a far grosser violation of its general character and spirit, to permit the enslaving of *one* freeman through its means, than the liberation of a *thousand* slaves."

With regard to the decision of the Supreme Court, in the case of Prigg *vs.* Pennsylvania, the report says:—"Your committee are deliberately of opinion, that a decision which arrives at a result so shocking to the feelings and principles of every citizen in a land of freedom, must be in its principle erroneous; and they hope that the time may yet come, when a revision, by persons, a majority of whom will not be directly interested in the question at issue, will restore to their vigor the genuine doctrines of liberty."

RHODE ISLAND.

A few weeks ago there was a communication in the Standard, signed "D. L. Y." which stated that an effort was being made in Rhode Island to get rid of *colored* citizens, under pretense of removing the Narragansett *Indians*. Since then, we have received a letter from Wm. Jackson, of South Kingston, which declares this statement to be erroneous. He says: "No such case has been referred to the legislature, or reported by a committee. One of the tribe himself petitioned for the privilege of selling his estate, which, after full inquiry, was granted."

We know not which of our correspondents have the right of the case.

COLORED SEAMEN.

The official documents on this subject have for some time been crowded out by articles of fresher interest. We now copy them, because they exhibit strongly, one of the thousand points of collision, which must for ever occur, in shapes more and more dangerous, between the antagonist principles of slavery and freedom embodied in this government. The assumption of Mr. Berrien, that it is the "duty of Congress to forbid the admission of colored seamen indiscriminately into all ports of the United States," is about as bold a demand as the South has yet made.

☞ Mr. Mason's valuable republication of the London Christian Observer, the Dublin University Magazine, and Blackwood, for February, have been out a week. Schiller's Poems and Ballads, and The World in London, are continued in Blackwood; and there is an Imaginary Conversation between Oliver Cromwell and Sir Oliver Cromwell, by Walter Savage Landor.

Among other good articles in the Dublin University Magazine, is a very interesting Review of George Borrow, The Gipsies in Spain, and the Bible in Spain.

AN APPROPRIATE NAME.—The headland upon which stands Monrovia, the capital of Liberia, is called *False* Cape. On the summit of this *false* Cape stands a flagstaff, whereon the American Flag waves in the wind, to crown the *false* Cape, of *false* "missionaries of freedom," sent out under *false* pretenses, by a *false* association, which well represents a *false* republic.

THE ANNUAL MEETING.—A. Brooke, of Ohio, is informed that the Annual Meeting of the American Society is always held at New-York, on the second Tuesday in May; the same week as all the other anniversaries. We are glad to hear that a delegation from the "Young Giant of the West" will be with us on that interesting occasion.

Anti-Slavery Items.

NEW-YORK AND VIRGINIA.—A prominent citizen of Virginia writes thus to the Albany Argus:

"The course of the *democracy* of New-York, in reference to the controversy with Virginia, cannot fail to produce *a deep impression at the South*—an impression favorable to harmony among the States, and to the integrity of the Union."

A bill to repeal the law for inspecting and taxing New-York vessels, was lately brought before the Virginia House of Delegates, and indefinitely postponed, by a vote of 85 to 50. The Richmond Enquirer says this odious law shall be repealed, as soon as New-York repeals her law granting Trial by Jury to those *claimed* as fugitive slaves. This the leaders of the democratic party in New-York, are trying their utmost to effect; thus showing themselves willing to sacrifice the plainest principles of freedom, for the sake of securing the vote of Virginia to Mr. Van Buren. It is said that Virginia, as "a reward of merit," will nominate Mr. Van Buren for President, and Mr. Ritchie (of the Richmond Enquirer) for Vice President. The North Carolina Standard places "the little fox" at the head of its columns, as candidate for the presidency, and says:

"We may here observe, that the preference for Mr. Van Buren does not imply a less respect and esteem for Mr. Calhoun. But many of our friends believe that Mr. Van Buren has fallen, while manfully contending for *southern rights*, and that he was peculiarly the victim of falsehood."

And this mutual game of venality is what men call *government!*

SLAVERY AND DEMOCRACY.—The Richmond Whig utters the following truths, though we fear for mere *party* purposes:

"Properly and strictly speaking, there is no such thing in the whole southern country, as a *democrat*, unless he be at war with the institutions that surround him. There is a total and irreconcilable hostility between a slaveholder and a democrat. The fundamental principle of the latter is, that *all* men are equal. The former cannot hold such a principle, without giving the lie to it by daily practice. If he holds such a sentiment, he has to suppress it, and in subservience to his interest, enact the constant hypocrite. The northern democrat, on the contrary, acts up to his interests, when he acts out his convictions of universal equality. Disguise it as they may, this radical difference pervades those who call themselves democrats, at the North and South; and when the southern Van Buren men, or locos, become in reality *democrats*, they cannot, and will not, any longer tolerate slavery. For THE SYSTEM OF SLAVERY IS AT WAR WITH DEMOCRACY; and those at the South who are now giving aid and countenance to what is called the democracy at the North, are in effect doing all in their power to subvert the social institutions of the South. A northern democrat, unless he be as great a hypocrite as a southern slaveholding democrat, must abhor slavery."

LEGISLATIVE DECORUM.—The New-York Herald, in its legislative reports, thus records Mr. Adams's two efforts to present the Latimer petition:

"*First Attempt.*—Mr. Adams—I now ask leave, sir, to present several petitions.

Cries of No, no—oh! let him get rid of the d—d old smut machine.

Speaker—The gentleman asks leave of the House to present several petitions which he holds in his hand.

A member—In his hand?

Wise—(pointing to the great petition rolled round a frame, on Mr. Adams's desk)—Is that thing one of the petitions he holds in his hand, sir? (It weighs about seventy pounds.)

Speaker—I presume it is.

A voice—Burn it.

Wise—I want to know, sir, if it is signed by a runaway slave from Virginia? (Here there was great excitement and confusion, and the House divided.) The petition was not allowed to be presented. Ayes, 80—Noes, 106.

Second Attempt.—In the House, to-day, almost as soon as the journal was read, Mr. Adams tried to introduce his biz Latimer petition, brought in on Monday, praying to absolve Massachusetts from assisting to catch runaway slaves; and of course it produced much excitement.

Mr. Adams—(rising and coming out from behind his petition, which completely hides him from the view of the members in front of him)—I ask leave, sir, to present a variety of petitions to this House.

Mr. Wise—Mr. Speaker—

Several members—(rising with warmth and eagerness, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Mallory—Sir, I object to the reception of these petitions.

Mr. Adams—Sir, I move a suspension of the rules. (Great excitement.)

Cries of No, no—go on—order—vote the nigger down.

A voice—I move Mr. Adams have leave to take his smut machine out of the House and burn it. (Great laughter.)

A member—I understand it's signed by a runaway nigger feller!

Mr. Mallory—I call for the ayes and noes.

They were ordered.

A FACETIOUS PRIEST.—The *Reverend* James Curley, of Georgetown, District of Columbia, presented the skin of an African, nicely tanned, to the National Cabinet of Curiosities, at Washington, on the second of July last. This was a fine idea; but to carry out the spirit of the design, we should like to see the skin of a certain white priest hung up by the side of it.—*Orleans Republican, a loco paper.*

Such is the brutal notice of a slaveholding paper. David L. Child says:

"The donor has certainly hit off herein an expressive epitome of American humanity and piety! 'Skin of an African, tanned, and presented by a *Reverend!*"

A writer in the Christian Witness suggests, that in order to make the nationality more complete, it would be well to have the Declaration of Independence fairly inscribed on the skin.

DR. W. H. BRISBANE.—This friend of humanity has lately removed from Ohio to Boston. He brought with him Isaac, whom he emancipated, when he left South Carolina for the West. He says:

"I found considerable difficulty in getting him along on the railroad from Baltimore. They required no little testimony that he was a freeman. This is one of the annoyances to which the free citizens of the North are subjected in the slave States, when accompanied by colored servants. The superintendent informed me that they had in one case to pay $1200, in consequence of a slave succeeding in passing on the road without discovery."

HARD LANGUAGE.—At the late Methodist convention, in Boston, a clergyman thus alluded to the charge of harsh language applied to slavery:

"Suppose, said he, a lion had broken loose, and was running through the street, destroying men, women, and children; would you whisper, There's a pussy in the street, there's a pussy in the street!"

TREASURER'S RECEIPTS

For the two weeks, ending 3d mo. (March) 4th, 1843.

Received for the Standard.—The following persons have each paid $2: Margaret Blydenburgh, N. H.; Joseph Hall, Skeneateles; A. G. Hopkins, Foster, R. I.; Warren Preston, Bangor, Me.; Wm. T. Allen, Peoria, Ill.; Joshua Simmons, Pendleton, Ia.; Paschal Morris, West Chester, Pa.; Mount Holyoke Seminary, South Hadley, Mass.; E. S. Hackley, Bridgewater, N. Y.; Lemuel Allen, Walpole, Mass.; J. & E. Morton, Plymouth, Mass.; Samuel Burling, Purchace, N. Y.; Andrew Varney, Collins, Erie county, N. Y.; I. S. Winans, Lima, N. Y.; Samuel Pusey, Little Britain, Lancaster county, Pa.; Henry Thomas, Cedarsville, Herkimer co N. Y.; Rhoda Boss, Middleville, Herkimer co. N. Y.; Theodore Ingham, Geneva, Wiskonsan; James Cole, Little Falls, Herkimer county, N. Y.; A. G. Larned, Bellville, Jefferson county, N. Y.; S. W. Brown, Little Falls, Herkimer county, N. Y.; Lucy Smith, do.; Charles Howland, Buffalo; John H. Curran, Brockets Bridge, N. Y.; Joseph Waterman, Lamoiville county, Vt.; William R. Thompson, Oxford, N. Y.; H. M. Griffith, East Bethlehem, Washington, Pa.; William Peckham, South Kingston, R. I.; N. H. Gibbs, East Wareham, Mass.; Lewis Tappan, New-York city; Samuel Barrett, Concord, Mass.; G. S. Flint, Rutland, Mass.; Mrs. H. P. Goodwin, Concord, Mass.; W. P. Tilden, Norton, Mass.; Zebulon P. White, do.

The following persons, Lancaster, Erie county, N. Y. have each paid $1 50: Arnold Green, Samuel Lord, Martin Root, Thomas Clark, Albert Martin, Harriet Dewey, Elias Bissell, Norman Kimball, Eleazer Bancroft, William Blackman, George Thomas, Aaron Mills, Jacob Minor, Reuben Banister, Samuel Charlesworth, J. N. Ely, Lewis Clapp. L. Soper, West Gaines, N. Y. $1: New Anti-Slavery Society, Oakfield, N. Y. $10; Ann Tomlinson, Newtown, Ct. $1; Henry Belden, Washingtonville, Orange county, N. Y. 50 cts.; John J. Lewis. LaGros, Wabash county, Ia. $1; Thomas Marshall. Hamerton, Chester county, Pa. $1; George Yuran, Lancaster, N. Y. $1; Eastern Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Society, $550. The following persons, Fairfield, Herkimer county, N. Y. have each paid $1 66: Horace Ford, Orlando Blanchard, Zachariah Reed, Alfred White, Henry Beers, Albert Favle. Mary Tisdale, Utica, $1; Lansinda Devereux, Little Falls, N. Y. $1; W. G. Borland, do. $1; Andover bundle, $1 50; Charles Perry, Westerly, R. I. $3 33. The following persons, Westerly, R. I. have each paid $1 67: Maria Burlingame, Horatio S. Berry, Aaron Pierce, Stephen Smith, Ethan Foster, and David Smith.

Donations.—J. S. Darling, Le Roy, N. Y. $5; L. Pratt, do. $5; Elizabeth A. Palmer, do. $3; I. M. Stanley, do. $1; Mrs. G. Grannis, do. $5; R. P. Smith, do. $2; J. H. Stanley, do. $2; Isaac Jacobs, Northville, N. Y. 50 cts.; Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, $600; Lucy Ann Tracy, Danielsville, Ct. $2 50; Rhoda Boss, Middleville, Herkimer county, N. Y. 50 cts.; William P. Hall, Little Falls, N. Y. 50 cts.; Thomas Favle, do. 50 cts.; Rowland Green, do. 50 cts.; H. H. Ingham, Manheim Centre, N. Y. $1; Joseph Carpenter, New Rochelle, N. Y. $1; Ladies Anti-Slavery Working Society, Willimantic, Ct. $7.

ISAAC T. HOPPER, *Treas'r.*

GENERAL INTELLIGENCE.

Foreign Items.

Dreadful Earthquake in the West Indies!—On the 8th of February, a very severe earthquake occurred in the West Indies, the vibrations of which were extensively felt in our southern States. In Antigua, all the houses are down, the mills and sugar works greatly injured, and the crop nearly destroyed. But few lives were lost. It is apprehended that a part of the island of Montserrat has sunk into the ocean. Mariners passing at a distance, saw Martinique, Guadaloupe, and Montserrat, enveloped in a dense cloud of dust. THE TOWN OF POINT PETRE, GUADALOUPE, IS ENTIRELY DESTROYED, AND TEN THOUSAND PERSONS ARE SUPPOSED TO HAVE BEEN KILLED. The loss of property is immense.

South America.—A fierce struggle has been going on between the Buenos Ayrean forces, under Gen. Oribe, on the one hand, and the Montevidean troops, under Rivera, on the other. It is stated that Rivera has been defeated and taken prisoner, and that the strength of the Unitarian party is completely broken. The government have, in consequence, liberated the slaves of both sexes, for the creation of a new armed body. The whole contest was between Oribe and Rivera, for the Presidency of the Oriental Republic—a country comprising about 90,000 miles, and as many inhabitants. And for this several thousand lives and millions of money have already been lost. It is said that the British minister has addressed a communication to Governor Rosas, to the effect that the war *must* be brought to an end, for the interests of humanity as well as of resident foreigners, and demanding the immediate cessation of hostilities.

The Revolution in Haiti.—The insurrectionary movement, which was considered so formidable, has been effectually suppressed by the government.

Brazil.—The young emperor, in his speech to the Chamber of Representatives, at the opening of its annual session, recommended them to employ themselves zealously with means for public instruction, and for promoting the introduction of *free labor* into Brazil.

Great Fire at Java.—A letter from Sourabaya, dated September 10th, 1842, states that more than *one thousand* houses, and a vast amount of property, had been destroyed by fire.

General Items.

Terrible Accident at Cincinnati.—On the 25th of February a fire broke out in the smoke-house of Messrs. Pugh & Alvord. To prevent its spreading, the smoke-house was closed as

Poetry.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

THE PRISON TOWER.

BY EMMELINE EVANS.

Yon dark gray tower, beside the sea,
Doth meet mine eye with morning light,
Like some old hall of chivalry,
Where lady gay and gallant knight
Meet still, to pass the festal day,
With harp, and dance, and minstrel lay.

Alas, fond fancy cannot veil
The bare, and bitter truth from me;
A hundred captives, faint and pale,
Pine in that tower, beside the sea;
Unheard their wild, despairing cries,
Save when to holy heaven they rise.

'Tis winter! On the shining hills,
The frolic deer are bounding free;
The huntsman o'er the frozen rills
Winds his horn, right merrily;
Unheard the sound, unmarked the hour,
By those who dwell in that lone tower.

Sweet spring wakes up the joyous earth,
Unnumbered blossoms bless the light,
And blue-eyed maidens, full of mirth,
Dance on the turf, in beauty bright;
Yet one as fair, doth weep the while,
And rend her hair, in yon dark pile.

Alas, my eyes grow dim with tears,
Though bright and gladsome is the day;
That pale and stricken form appears,
To chase each rosy smile away;
And says, How can thy soul be glad?
Thy sister's heart is faint and sad.

Oh, ye who hold the mighty scale
Of life or death, of weal or wo,
Be lenient to your brother frail;
Doom not his erring heart to know
The wearying pang, through long, long years,
Of hopeless grief—of bootless tears.

Pittsburgh, Feb. 15, 1843.

From the Democratic Review, for February, 1843.

A PARABLE.

BY JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

Worn and footsore was the prophet
When he reached the holy hill;
"God has left the earth," he murmured,
"Here his presence lingers still.

"God of all the olden prophets,
Wilt thou talk with me no more?
Have I not as truly loved thee
As thy chosen ones of yore?

"Hear me, guider of my fathers,
Lo, an humble heart is mine:
By thy mercy I beseech thee,
Grant thy servant but a sign!"

Bowing then his head, he listened
For an answer to his prayer;
No loud burst of thunder followed,
Not a murmur stirred the air;

But the tuft of moss before him
Opened while he waited yet,
And from out the rock's hard bosom
Sprang a tender violet.

"God! I thank thee," said the prophet;
"Hard of heart and blind was I,
Looking to the holy mountain
For the gift of prophecy.

"Still, thou speakest with thy children,
Freely as in old sublime;
Humbleness, and love, and patience,
Give dominion over time.

"Had I trusted in my nature,
And had faith in lowly things,
Thou thyself would'st then have sought me,
And set free my spirit's wings.

"But I looked for signs and wonders,
That o'er men should give me sway;
Thirsting to be more than mortal,
I was even less than clay.

"Ere I entered on my journey,
As I girt my loins to start,
Ran to me my little daughter,
The beloved of my heart;

"In her hand she held a flower,
Like to this as like may be,
Which beside my very threshold
She had plucked and brought to me."

From Graham's Magazine, for March.

THE CROWDED STREET.

BY WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT.

Let me move slowly through the street,
Filled with an ever shifting train,
Amid the sound of steps that beat
The murmuring walks like summer rain.

How fast the flitting figures come!
The mild, the fierce, the stony face;
Some bright with thoughtless smiles, and some
Where secret tears have left their trace.

They pass—to toil, to strife, to rest;
To halls in which the feast is spread;
To chambers where the funeral guest
In silence sits beside the dead.

And some to happy homes repair,
Where children, pressing cheek to cheek,
Where mute caresses shall declare
The tenderness they cannot speak.

And some, who walk in calmness here,
Shall shudder as they reach the door,
Where one who made their dwelling dear,
Its flower, its light, is seen no more.

Youth, with pale cheek and slender frame,
And dreams of greatness in thine eye!
Goest thou to build an early name,
Or early in the task to die?

Keen son of trade, with eager brow!
Who is now fluttering in thy snare?
Thy golden fortunes, tower they now,
Or melt the glittering spires in air?

Who of this crowd, to-night, shall tread
The dance till daylight gleams again?
Who sorrow o'er the untimely dead?
Who writhe in throes of mortal pain?

Some, famine-struck, shall think how long
The cold, dark hours—how slow the light!
And some, who flaunt amid the throng,
Shall hide in dens of shame to-night.

Each, where his task or pleasures call,
They pass, and heed each other not.
There is who heeds, who holds them all,
In His large love and boundless thought.

These struggling tides of life that seem
In wayward, aimless course to tend,
Are eddies of the mighty stream
That rolls to its predestined end.

"This above all!—to thine own self be true!
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

Miscellany.

ACTIVE BENEVOLENCE—ELIZABETH FRY.

We are indebted, for the subjoined very interesting article, to the "Lady's Book," for December. It is translated by one of the editors of that agreeable miscellany, Mrs. S. J. Hale, from the French of Madame Adele Du Thou's "History of the Quakers."

Elizabeth Gurney was the third daughter of Mr. John Gurney, Marlam Hall, county of Norfolk, (England.) She was born in 1780, and, as her mother died soon after, this young girl was subject to little control. Her father was very indulgent, and, though belonging to the Society of Friends, he was not very strict in restraining his child to the companionship of those of her own sect. Elizabeth was very handsome, and her birth, fortune, and education, entitled her to associate with the best of society. She went to London when she was seventeen, and mingled in all the gay amusement, which the capital afforded. Still, she showed, even at that age, an ardent wish to improve herself, and learn everything which this new scene presented. Soon after her return, the family were visited by some of their Quaker connections, who were deeply imbued with the pious spirit, that has so often been exhibited by the devout of this sect. Elizabeth's mind was awakened, and her heart changed. She adopted the plain garb of the Friends, gave up all amusements, and thenceforward devoted herself to doing good. Her first plan of usefulness was to open a school, in her father's house, for poor children. This young and lovely girl went out, and gathered from the abodes of poverty, from the lanes and fields, twenty-four of these destitute little beings, whom, day by day, she instructed and comforted. What a beautiful example for young ladies!

In 1800, Elizabeth Gurney was married to Mr. Fry, a gentleman of the most estimable character, who aided her benevolent plans, and generously allowed her a considerable sum for charities; and, more than this, he was willing that she should devote the greater portion of her time to these missions of charity. It was while engaged in such, comparatively, private labors of love, that Mrs. Fry, hearing of the deplorable condition of the female prisoners in Newgate, resolved to relieve them. She applied to the governor, for leave to visit them. He attempted to dissuade her. "You will be disgusted with their behaviour and language," said he. "I am almost afraid, myself, to enter their apartment—they are so vile."

"I am fully aware of the danger," meekly replied Mrs. Fry. "I do not go in my own strength. God will protect me."

"But, madam, if you are determined on entering this den of iniquity, pray leave your purse and watch behind," said the governor.

"I thank thee; I am not afraid; I do not think I shall lose anything," replied this heroic woman.

She entered an apartment of the prison, in which were confined about *one hundred and sixty women*: the condemned, and those who were awaiting trial, being all huddled together, with many children, who were thus brought up in the school of vice. The cries and curses, of those poor little victims of their parents' crimes, added the darkest shade to the dreadful picture, which met the pitying eyes of this angel of mercy. The astonished inmates of the prison gazed on her, as though she were indeed an angel. The pure and tranquil expression of her beautiful countenance soon softened their ferocity. It has been remarked, that if virtue could be rendered visible, it would be impossible to resist its influence. In Mrs. Fry, virtue seemed indeed embodied, so lovely and attractive was the manner of her benevolence; and this may account for the influence she at once gained over this host of abandoned creatures, who had seemed worse than savages.

She addressed them in the most gentle accents. "You seem unhappy," said she; "you are in want of clothes; would you not be pleased if some one came to relieve your misery?"

"Certainly," said one; "we need clothes." "But nobody cares for us; and where can we find a friend?" said another.

"I am come to serve you, if you will allow me," said Elizabeth Fry. She then went on to express her sympathy for them, and offer them hope, that they might improve their condition. She did not say a word about the crimes they had committed, nor utter any reproach. She came to comfort, and not to condemn them. When she was about to depart, the women thronged around her.

"You are leaving us," said they; "and you will never come again."

"Yes, I will come again, if ye desire it," she replied.

"We do! we do!" was echoed round the apartment.

In a short time, Mrs. Fry made her second visit, and intended to pass the whole day. The doors were closed and barred, and she was left alone with the prisoners. "You must not suppose," said she to them, "that I have come without being commissioned." She raised the Bible, which she brought in her hand, and continued: "This book, which has been the guide of my life, has brought me to you. It directed me to visit the prisoners; to take pity on the poor and afflicted. You are afflicted. I am willing to do all in my power to relieve you; but all my efforts will be in vain, unless you help. Are you willing to hear me read a few passages from this book?"

They assented; and she read from Matthew xx. the parable of the lord of the vineyard. When she came to a man who was hired at the eleventh hour, she paused a moment, and then said, in a gentle, but impressive tone, "The eleventh hour now strikes for you, my friends. The greater part of your lives has been lost; but Christ is come to save sinners."

Some asked who Christ was? Others said that he had not come for them; that the time was passed, and they could not be saved.

Mrs. Fry replied, that Christ had died to save sinners; the poor and afflicted, in particular, he invited to come to him, for he had been poor and afflicted.

She passed the whole day with them; and during this visit, laid the foundation of a most happy change in that gloomy prison. She soon obtained permission to establish a school for the children of those poor women; and when she saw how joyfully their mothers acceded to her proposal of giving religious instruction to their little ones, she felt sure of success. The woman whose maternal affection is warm and sure, cannot be wholly lost to virtue. And thus she went on, softening, by her words of peace and acts of love, the most turbulent and perverse tempers, and even taming the violence of the unruly tongue, which it would seem only a miracle could have accomplished. The reform was most astonishing; and, thanks to her perseverance, and the years she has devoted to this pious undertaking, a total change has been effected in the female department of this prison. The influence of virtue has prevailed; and many wretched beings have found Newgate an asylum of repentance and heavenly hope.

From the New-York Evangelist.

THE CHRISTIAN ARTIST.

We have noticed, in a recent periodical, an account of the death of JOHN HENRY DANNECKER, one of the first sculptors of modern times, and undoubtedly the first, perhaps the only *Christian* artist of his age. We do not mean to imply by this, that no other artist has been a believer in Christian truth, or influenced by Christian principle, but that no other one has, to such an extent, made his art a medium for the expression of the class of ideas and emotions peculiar to Christianity.

The history of Dannecker is highly eventful and interesting. He was the son of one of the grooms of the Duke of Wirtemberg, and of course, received no early culture. His passion for drawing, however, was very early manifested, and it is said, that when unable to procure paper for his purposes, he often covered the slabs of a neighboring stone-cutter with his designs. His talent at length became known to the duke, who undertook his education, at his own expense. He studied at Rome, under Canova; and such was the purity and tranquillity of his spirits, so elevated and heavenly his conceptions of art, that he received from this artist the surname of "Il beato," (or, "the Blessed One.") During his stay in Italy, his talents procured him an appointment to the academies, both of Rome and Bologna; and after his return, he was appointed, by his patron, professor of the fine arts in his academy. He accomplished several works of art, many of them upon classical subjects, but he invested everything that he touched with a spiritual earnestness and dignity, far exceeding the mere physical perfection of the antique. Whenever he represented physical beauty, it was still touched and glorified by the brightness of immortality, as if in the perfection of the earthly he beheld the foreshadowing of the heavenly.

But the great work to which he believed himself divinely called, and on which he exhausted all the fervor and enthusiasm of his deep spirit, was a representation of the Mediator between God and man.

The manner in which he felt himself called to so solemn and sublime a theme is peculiar. He had long and earnestly meditated that highest problem of Christian art, "How should the God-man be presented—and the union of the awful and the infinite, with the sympathetic and tender, be shadowed forth in human form?"

Nor did artist ever pursue, with more intense ardor, the yet unfounded image of the perfect and the beautiful, than Dannecker followed this still retreating mystery. At length, a dream unveiled before him that face and form which he had vainly striven to create—"This is He!—this *must* be He! —this can be no other!"—was the solemn and thrilling certainty of his soul; and he awoke, with an uneffaceable impression that to him it was given to achieve this most sacred triumph of religious art.

Though others might regard it as a dream, yet in the enthusiasm of his spirit, he looked upon it as a sacred reality, an immediate revelation from the Redeemer, and regarded himself henceforth as sanctified and enobled by a heavenly commission, to which he devoted himself with absorbing zeal. Day and night the unutterable vision stood before him, every line and lineament as clear as in the first hour of revelation.

During eight years it was his unintermitting study and effort; and the result was, a production, which, in the estimation of both artists and Christians, has as nearly accomplished his object as human conception can receive the idea.

The marble statue was purchased by the emperor Alexander, and is now in Russia. The clay model in which the artist embodied his first idea, is in a church at Stuttgardt. We have never seen it, but received from a friend an account of the impression produced by a sight of it.

"After breakfast," he says, "a friend of ours said to us, come down to the church, and see 'Dannecker's Christ.' 'Dannecker's Christ?' We had never heard of the work, not being familiar with the records of German art, but we had achieved so much sight-seeing (particularly on sacred subjects,) with so little satisfaction, that we proceeded with indifference.

But immediately on entering the church, our eye was arrested—we paused, involuntarily became silent, and stood breathless, motionless, and absorbed. We needed none to say to us, 'This is He!' but seemed to be overshadowed by an awful yet beloved presence. How long we stood, I know not—I only know that we made no comments, either to each other, or to our friend—that we looked at nothing else in the church—but returned to our lodgings in perfect silence; nor was it until some time after, that we began to say to each other, 'How wonderful—how beautiful—how sublime!'

I can give you few particulars by which you can form any idea of this statue. It is placed in the centre of a large church, at the junction of four aisles. It represents the Saviour as standing, with one hand gently upraised, in the attitude of speaking, and the immediate impression that it produces is, 'Never man spake like this man.' The dress is the seamless robe, a simple single garment, reaching to the feet. The hair is parted on the forehead, and hangs in curls upon the shoulders. So far, I can remember, but the face I have never been able to recall. The impression, so far as I can remember, was produced by no one thing alone, but a divine harmony, in the face, figure, and attitude, exciting an emotion so immediate and undivided, as to disarm criticism, and produce emotion, rather than reflection; and though I have often striven to recall the image to my mind, that I might analyse its power, I have never been able to do it. I can only remember the general outlines, and the overwhelming effect."

Dannecker afterwards produced another copy of this statue for the mother of the Prince of Thurn and Taxis, and it is now in the church of Neresheim, in the kingdom of Wirtemberg.* It is said, by artists, to excel even his first effort. He also produced a statue of St. John, in which the apparently conflicting attributes of the "Son of Thunder, and the beloved disciple, have been admirably combined." His last work, executed in extreme old age, is the Christian Death angel, guiding an aged man through the shadow of death, and pointing to him an unfolding heaven—a lovely and fitting image to cheer the last hours of a Christian artist.

Perhaps, in reading the account of the most sacred effort of this gifted man, many a simple Christian heart has breathed the desire, "Oh, that I could see it"—but let him take comfort from the thought, that the ORIGINAL is more glorious than the copy, and that the poorest and meanest follower of Jesus, is in a strait and sure way to see *that*. Heaven is nearer than Europe—and the vision which shall reveal to us the perfection of all beauty and grandeur, may be distant from us only by a few days—perhaps by a few hours. H. E. B. S.

Walnut Hills, Ohio.

* It may be proper to remark, that Dannecker was a devout Protestant, and that these statues are none of them in Catholic churches.

HOW TO DO GOOD.

BY CHARLES QUILL.

The duties of life are not all of the great and exciting sort. There are many duties in every day; but there are few days in which one is called to mighty efforts or heroic sacrifices. I am persuaded that most of us are better prepared for great emergencies, than for the exigencies of the passing hour. Paradox as this is, it is tenable, and may be illustrated by palpable instances. There are many men who would, without the hesitation of an instant, plunge into the sea, to rescue a drowning child, but who, the very next hour, would break an engagement, or sneer at an awkward servant, or frown unjustly on an amiable wife.

Life is made up of these little things. According to the character of household words, looks, and trivial actions, is the true temper of our virtue. Hence there are many men reputed good, and, as the world goes, really so, who belie, in domestic life, the promise of their holyday and Sunday demeanor. Great in the large assembly, they are little at the fireside. Leaders, perhaps, of public benevolence, they plead for universal love, as the saving principle of the social compact: yet, when they are among their dependents, they are peevish, morose, severe, or in some other way constantly sinning against the law of kindness.

Why do you begin to do good *so far off?* This is a ruling error. Begin at the centre, and work outwards. If you do not love your wife, do not pretend to such love for the people of the antipodes. If you let some family grudge, some peccadillo, some undesirable gesture, sour your visage toward a sister or a daughter, pray cease to preach beneficence on a large scale.

What do you mean by "doing good?" Is it not increasing human happiness? Very well! But *whose* happiness? Not the happiness of A, B, or C, in the planet Saturn, but that of fellow-terrestrials; not of the millions you never see, so much as that of the hundreds, or scores, whom you see every day. Begin to make people happy. It is a good work—it is the best work. Begin, not next door, but within your own door; with your next neighbor—whether relative, servant, or superior. Account the man you meet, the man you are to bless. Give him such things as you have. "How can I make him or her happier?" This is the question. If a dollar will do it, give the dollar. If advice will do it, give advice. If reproof will do it, give reproof. If a look, a smile, or warm pressure of the hand, or a tear will do it, give the look, smile, hand, or tear. But never forget that the happiness of our world is a mountain of golden sands, and that it is your part to cast some contributory atom almost every moment.

I would hope that such suggestions, however hackneyed, will not be without their influence,

"On that best portion of a good man's life,
His little, nameless, unremembered acts
Of kindness and of love."

In a season of great reverses and real suffering in the mercantile and manufacturing world, there is occasion for the luxury of doing good. The happiest mechanic I ever knew was a hatter, who had grown rich, and who felt himself thereby exalted only in this sense, that his responsibility as a steward was increased. It was sacred wealth,

"For God, who gave the riches, gave the heart,
To sanctify the whole, by giving part."

The poorest man may lessen his neighbor's load. He who has no gold, may give what gold cannot purchase. If religion does not make men who profess it more ready to render others happy, it is a pretense. We are to be judged at the last by this rule. The inquiry is to be especially concerning our conduct toward the sick, the prisoner, the pauper, and the foreigner. The neighbor whom we are to love is our next door neighbor: that is, the man who falls in our way. The Samaritan knew this. It was but a small pittance he gave: the poorest among us may go and do likewise. Do not allow a townsman, or a stranger, or even an emigrant, to suffer for lack of your endeavors. It will cost you little, but it will be much to him.

"'Tis a little thing
To give a cup of water; yet its draught,
Of cool refreshment, drained by fevered lips,
May give a shock of pleasure to the frame,
More exquisite than when nectarian juice
Renews the life of joy in happiest hours.
It is a little thing to speak a phrase
Of common comfort, which by daily use
Has almost lost its sense; yet on the ear
Of him who thought to die unmourned, 'twill fall
Like choicest music."

Let no one be surprised at my quoting choice poetry to mechanics. Servile boors may stare in amaze; but the *American* mechanic is no boor. Who shall dare to say that the poorest journeyman may not reach forth his hand in the garden of the muses? And who shall deny to the honest laborer the solace of doing good? It is the best work in the worst times. Help others, and you relieve yourself. Go out, and drive away the cloud from that distressed friend's brow, and you will return with a lighter heart. Take heed to the *little things*—the trifling, unobserved language or action—passing in a moment. A syllable may stab a blessed hope: a syllable may revive the dying. A frown may crush a gentle heart: the smile of forgiveness may relieve from torture. He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much.

"THERE IS NO CHURCH."

There is no church, sayest thou? The voice of prophecy has gone dumb? This is even what I dispute; but in any case, hast thou not still preaching enough? A preaching friar settles himself in every village; and builds a pulpit, which he calls Newspaper. Therefrom he preaches what most momentous doctrine is in him, for man's salvation; and dost not thou listen and believe? Look well, thou seest everywhere a *new* clergy, of the Mendicant Orders, some barefooted, some almost barebacked, fashion itself into shape, and teach and preach, zealously enough, for copper alms and the love of God. These break in pieces the ancient idols; and though themselves too often reprobate, (as idol-breakers are wont to be,) they work out the sties of new churches, where the true God-ordained, *that are to follow*, may find audience, and minister. Said I not, before the *old* skin was shed, the *new* had formed itself beneath it?

"But there is no religion," reiterates the professor. Fool! I tell thee there *is*. Hast thou considered all that lies in this immeasurable froth-ocean we name Literature? Fragments of a genuine Church-*Homiletic* lie scattered there, which time will assort; nay, fractions even of a *Liturgy* could I point out. And knowest thou no prophet, even in the vesture, environment, and dialect of *this* age? None to whom the godlike has revealed itself, through all meanest and highest forms of the common; and by him been again prophetically revealed? In whose inspired melody, even in these rag-gathering and rag-burning days, man's life again begins, were it but afar off, to be divine? Knowest thou none such?

But *thou* as yet standest in no temple; joinest in no psalm-worship; feelest well that where there is no ministering priest, the people perish? Be of comfort! Thou art not alone, if thou have faith. Spake we not of a communion of saints, unseen, yet not unreal, accompanying and brother-like embracing thee, so thou be worthy? Their heroic sufferings rise up melodiously together to heaven, out of all lands, and out of all times, as a sacred *Miserere*; their heroic actions, also, as a boundless, everlasting psalm of triumph. Neither say thou that thou hast now no symbol of the godlike. Is not God's universe a symbol of the godlike? Is not immensity a temple? Is not man's history, and men's history, a perpetual Evangile? Listen, and for organ-music thou wilt ever, as of old, hear the "Morning Stars sing together."—*T. Carlyle.*

From the Christian World.

THE LAW OF KINDNESS.

I am glad to see you have spoken out on the subject of the cruelty practised on the insane. There is a matter of still deeper interest, which you ought to take up, and over which my heart bleeds. It is known, yes, it can be proved, that the chief reason why our admirable penitentiaries cannot reform those who come under their influence is, that society bars up its gates against their return—that, unlike the father of the prodigal son, human mercy closes its doors at the approach of the reformed culprit, and bids him starve, or go back to the swine's husks. And, in this business of casting back into the flames those whom Christ would, above all, have rejoiced to save, I fear it is true that the Christian part of the public, rather those who pride themselves on self-righteousness, are sadly prominent.

Let me give an instance or two of what I mean. A shoemaker was lately liberated from our penitentiary, a reformed man. He immediately offered himself to several master workmen for employment, and engaged to toil for some time for mere bread; but he felt afraid to let them know where he had been, lest, discovering it afterwards, he should be turned out with insult. Lo, and behold! six reputable employers rejected him at once. He "might steal, for all they cared; might starve, but 'twas nothing to them." When he was just ready to despair, when he felt that God was abandoning him, that it "did no sort of good to try," a worthy and unpretending man did the Samaritan's deed of taking him into his service, where he has conducted excellently well ever since.

And now see the opposite side. Edward D. Gray, the companion of Robinson, of infamous memory, relates, over his own name, that, on being released from confinement, he determined to lead a new life, and obtained a situation as a clerk in Wall street. He had not been there long, yet had won the confidence of his employer, when the absent partner of the firm returned. This event ruined him. The newcomer insisted on Gray's immediate discharge; and the result of it was, that "courage gone, all's gone;" after a few unsuccessful attempts to get business, he again fell; and was sent back, by the savage cruelty of society, to have its curse printed in deeper letters on his soul.

I knew a case similar to this, in a poor Swede, now in New-York, the son of a clergyman. But the theme is too sad. F. W. H.

From the New-York Evangelist.

FLORENCE.

"Girt by her theatre of hills, she reaps
Her corn, and wine, and oil, and plenty leaps
To laughing life, with her redundant horn."

One of the most pleasing characters I ever met with in my life, is a "*Florentine Flower Girl.*" These girls are often very beautiful; they dress in a costume somewhat peculiar, generally wearing a plain Leghorn flat, having a very wide brim, with flowers fastened around the crown. They seem to study a careless and happy manner, and to commend themselves to strangers by their good-humored smiles. I was quite taken by surprise when a lovely looking girl came running up to me in the street, with all the freedom of an old acquaintance, and handed me a fine bouquet, from a basket which she carried on her arm. I thought she had mistaken her person, and began to draw back, not a little abashed by her familiarity. She reached the flowers to me, exclaiming, "*Prenez! prenez!*" ("take them! take them!") and fixed them in the buttonhole of my coat. While I was preparing to pay her for them, (for I perceived I must keep them, *nolens volens*,) she turned herself, and was off in an instant. This seemed more curious still; and I embraced the first opportunity to inquire why the girls were so good to me as to load me with flowers! It appears that this is the way they support themselves; they never stop to take pay when they give away their flowers, but expect a present when the visitor leaves the city. They bring fresh flowers every day, and when they see a stranger, they easily find out where he lodges, and meet him regularly with their morning offering. There is a delicacy about the matter which pleases the stranger, and there is nothing immodest in the conduct of the girls. The Tuscan peasantry are universally of this character, joyous and affable; and whatever seeming boldness may be observed in their manners, is only a freedom and good cheer, due to their atmosphere and natural scenery. I am quite enamored of the Florentine character. There is a mildness and good-humor, a friendly feeling and warm-heartedness, about the people, which never fails to win the regard of strangers. Indeed, this remark is true, for the most part, of all the Italians; they are good, if they are not great; and, as I heard a gentleman observe at Genoa, "You may not respect them, but *you must love them!*" The peasantry of Tuscany are generally intelligent, fond of learning, dignified in their manners, and remarkably handsome. The men are tall, robust, and finely proportioned; and the women are of middle stature, with bewitching black eyes, expressive brows, and very graceful bearing. The Tuscan farmer shares equally with his lord in the produce of an estate; indeed, the owner often provides the implements of husbandry, and all the seeds, plants, &c. which are used on the farm. The color of the oxen of Tuscany is almost always the same; I have never seen one in Italy, of any other than a handsome dove color. It is singular that this color should be so universal. The environs of Florence are said to contain 6,000 villas, or country houses; and the country all around is divided into small farms, with a neat house on each. The peasants occupy dwellings which are peculiarly neat and commodious. Ariosto, when he saw the hills around Florence so full of palaces and villas, said it seemed as if the soil produced them. "And if thy palaces," continued he, "which are thus dispersed, were concentrated within one wall, two Romes could not vie with thee!"

The female peasantry work in the fields as efficiently as the men. They are bred to anything but effeminacy. Shoes and stockings are considered quite a superfluity; and are only worn on entering the city. Often they are carried on the head in a basket for a great distance, and then put on at the entrance of a town. This shows that they are simple and natural in their habits, but by no means deficient in self-respect and decency.

When marriages take place among the peasantry, the bans are published three times in a parish church. The bride's portion is paid three days before the marriage, one half in wearing apparel, and the other half in money. The money is usually expended by the bridegroom in purchasing jewels for his lady, which consist of a pearl necklace, cross, and earrings, sometimes intermixed with rubies, and worth about one hundred and fifty dollars. These jewels are preserved as the exclusive property of the wife; they are brought out and exhibited on gala days; and generally continue in the family for ages, unless the owners are compelled to sell or pawn them, through the necessity of poverty.

FIGS VERSUS SUGAR.

The Paris correspondent of the Prussian State Gazette, gives the following account of a recent discovery, which, if the statement is correct, may lead to the most important consequences:

"The struggle that has been going on for so many years in France, between the beet root and the sugar cane, seems likely to become still more intricate, in consequence of the unexpected appearance of a new candidate in the field. It has been discovered at Algiers, that the fruit of the fig cactus, a plant that grows there in immense quantities, contains such an abundance of saccharine matter, that the heat of the sun is sufficient to distil and crystalize the sugar. This discovery was the result of a mere accident. The fig of the cactus is eaten in great quantities by the French troops, during the summer months. At Maskara, this summer, the consumption was such, that the authorities ordered the streets to be cleared of the peels or husks, which had been thrown there in such masses as to be deemed dangerous to public health. The rubbish thus collected was deposited in a heap outside of the town, where the pile, exposed to the full heat of the sun, became covered in a few days with an incrustation that looked like saltpetre, and that attracted the attention of General Lumoriciere, the commandant of Maskara. The general ordered some of the crystalized matter to be collected, which, on a closer investigation, was found to be sugar, of remarkable purity and excellence. It has since been calculated that the abundance in which the plant exists, and the low price at which the fruit is sold, would allow sugar to be manufactured from it in large quantities, at about four sous (two pence) a pound. The cultivation of the plant can, however, be extended almost indefinitely, for it thrives even on the poorest soils, and to propagate it, all that is required, is to plant one of the leaves."

Specimens of the sugar, it appears, has been sent to the governor-general, who had taken up the subject with great zeal, and meant to do his utmost to induce the colonists to devote themselves to the cultivation of the fig cactus on a large scale.

MODES OF SALUTATIONS.

The following sketch of the various forms of salutation in vogue among the various portions of the "world's inhabitants," may be interesting to many:

Laplanders apply their noses strongly against the persons they salute.

In New Guinea, they place leaves upon the head of those they salute.

The inhabitants of the Phillippines bend very low, placing their hands on their cheeks, and raise one foot in the air, with the knee bent.

Two negro kings on the coast of Africa, salute by snapping the middle finger three times.

The inhabitants of Cammene, when they would show a particular attachment, open a vein, and present the blood to their friends as a beverage.

If the Chinese meet after a long separation, they fall on their knees, bend their face to the earth two or three times, and use many other modes. They have also a kind of ritual, or "Academy of Compliments," by which they regulate the number of bows, genuflections, and words to be spoken upon any occasion. Ambassadors practise these ceremonies forty days before they appear at court.

In Otaheite, they rub their noses together.

The Dutch, who are considered as great eaters, have a morning salutation common amongst all ranks, "Smaakelyke eeten," "May you eat a hearty dinner!" Another is, "Hoe vaart awe!" "How do you sail?" adopted, no doubt, in the early periods of the republic, when they were all navigators and fishermen.

The usual salutation at Cairo is, "How do you sweat?" a dry, hot skin being a sure indication of a destructive, ephemeral fever. Some author has observed, in contrasting the haughty Spaniard with the frivolous Frenchman, that the proud, steady gait, and inflexible solemnity of the former, were expressed in his mode of salutation, "Come esta?" "How do you stand?" Whilst the "Comment vous portez vous?" "How do you carry yourself?" was equally expressive of the gay motion and incessant action of the latter.

WASHINGTON'S STATUE.

Mr. Greenough has presented a memorial to Congress, praying to have his statue of Washington removed to the grounds in front of the western façade of the capitol, &c. In the course of this memorial, the sculptor defends his work from the criticisms that have been made on it, and says, "Having already out-lived the sneer with which it was intended to crush his first effort to make a bust of a distinguished fellow-citizen 'without a shirt,' he trusts that the prejudice which has yielded in these few years the neck and shoulders as objects not unfit to look upon, will continue to decline before the efforts of high art, until his successors in sculpture shall be enabled to show that the inspired writer meant not merely the face, when he declared that God had made Man after his own image."

A BLESSING ON THE FARMER.

He is a public benefactor who, by the prudent and skillful outlay of his money in bettering its condition, shall make a single field yield permanently a double crop; and he who does this, over a square mile, virtually adds a square mile to the national territory—nay, he does more; he doubles to this extent the territorial resources of the country, without giving the State any larger territory to defend. All hail, then, to the improvers of the soil! health and long life be their fortune—may their hearts be light and their purses heavy—may their dreams be few and pleasant, and their sleep the sweet repose of he weary—may they see the fruits of their own labor, and may their sons reap still heavier harvests.—[*Blackwood's Magazine.*

FOR HOUSEKEEPERS AND FARMERS.

Oxford Sausages.—The following recipe for making the celebrated Oxford sausages, so much desiderated by the lovers of good eating in England, is from a late English publication:

Ingredients.—One pound and a half of pig meat cut from the griskins without any skin, and half a pound of veal. One pound and a half of beef suet, the yolks and whites of five eggs. A dessert spoonful of sifted sage, after being well dried. Pepper and salt to taste.

To make the above into Sausages.—Chop the meat into small pieces, and then pound it together in a marble mortar till it is short and tender.

Chop the suet very fine, and when the eggs are well beaten together, after the whites are cast out, pour the liquid over the pounded meat and chopped suet, well kneading it together with a clean hand, throwing in the sifted sage, and pepper and salt from a coarsish pepper-box during the operation, so as to let them impregnate the whole mass without being predominant in any part of it.

Press the whole, when well mixed together, into a wide-mouthed jar, and keep it from the air, in a cold place.

Roll the sausages on a flour board, and use very little grease in frying them, as they will be fat enough to fry themselves with the aid of a frying-pan.

Southern Planter.

Warmth in feeding Cattle.—A late English paper states, that at the Clithero agricultural meeting, a communication was read from Professor Playfair, which contained the following facts worthy the attention of every farmer in a cold climate:

"Heat is an equivalent for food, and by knowledge of this fact, we may economize the latter very considerably. We know that cattle fatten much more slowly in winter than in summer, the reason being that part of the food is expended in the production of the necessary heat. Lord Ducie was kind enough to communicate to me an experiment of his, in which there were one hundred sheep in the open air, and another hundred in the same space, with sheds to retire into at pleasure. The first lot ate twenty-five pounds of Swedes (turneps) per day, the latter only twenty pounds; but the lot, with five pounds a day less, had gained on an average two pounds per sheep more than the other, at the conclusion of the experiment."

Compression of Wood.—A few years ago a mechanical puzzle, made of mahogony rods passing through a hole in a piece of box-wood, was solved by pressing one of the projections in a vice till it was reduced to half its former thickness; the resumption of its original size, being afterwards effected by steeping the wood in warm water. It was at that time pointed out how this principle of compression might be practically applied with advantage. Hammers, choppers, and numerous other tools, may have their wooden handles thus immovably fixed, by making the hole or mortise in the iron of a tapering form, compressing the end of the handle so as to cause it to pass through the small entrance, and then soaking the wood in water to re-expand it. The bars of chairs, and the planks for flooring boards, might be united in a firm manner by similar means.

Saturday Magazine.

Curious Tree.—The editor of the Ploughman says he has seen, in the garden of the Rev. Mr. Richardson, of Hingham, Mass. an apple-tree which must be nearly two hundred years old. Twenty years ago it was hollow, and was supported by a mere shell, or rind, not more than two inches in thickness. Mr. Richardson then had occasion to raise the ground round it, for a way, to the height of five or six feet, with stone and gravel. This gave the tree new life; it has since flourished, and is now a very constant bearer. Any common sized man may go down into this tree, as in a well, to the depth of six feet.

To Catch Rats.—An Ohio paper states, that as many as thirty-six rats have been taken in one night, by the following plan: Take a smooth kettle, fill it to within six inches of the top with water, cover the surface with chaff, or bran, then place it, in the evening, where the rats harbor.

Health, Quiet, and Comfort!!

THE Graham House, 63 Barclay street, New-York proffers advantages to strangers stopping a few days or weeks in the city, such as are rarely offered. It is eligibly located, on a clean and airy street, very near the business part of the city, and in the immediate vicinity of the principal steamboat landings. Its apartments are convenient and neat, while its table is supplied with the best vegetables and fruits that can be procured, excluding, entirely, animal food, and stimulants of all kinds. Charges moderate, and every effort made to render boarders comfortable. Shower baths free. Remember, 63.

New-York, October 20, 1842. 6m

REMOVAL.

LYDIA WHITE has removed from 219 North Second street, to the Northwest corner of Fifth and Cherry streets, where she will continue to keep a general assortment of groceries, the product of free-labor, wholesale and retail.

Also, the dry goods manufactured by the American Free Produce Association.

Just received, fifty barrels prime Laguira sugar.

Philadelphia, Second month 2d, 1843.

Popular English Periodicals,

Republished in New-York

LONDON, QUARTERLY, EDINBURGH, FOREIGN AND WESTMINSTER REVIEWS:

Blackwood's and the Dublin University Magazines;

AND THE LONDON CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

☞ The above periodicals continue to be published at *one-third the price of the English edition*, with the same fidelity which has been universally acknowledged to characterize their execution. The publisher wishes it to be distinctly understood, that these periodicals are delivered to the subscribers in the principal cities of the Union, *free of postage, or other incidental expense*; the Magazines within the same month of their publication in England, and the Reviews immediately afterwards, with the utmost despatch.

TERMS.—The numbers of each work are issued separately, and are printed with good type on a large octavo page, and on paper of a superior quality. Blackwood's Magazine, the Dublin University, and the Christian Observer, are *facsimiles* of the original works; the size of the Reviews differs very little from the European editions, and their execution is quite as good in every particular.

For the four Reviews,	$8	For Blackwood's Mag.	$4
Three of them,	$7	Dublin University,	$4
Two of them,	$5	Christian Observer,	$2
One of them,	$3		

☞ All subscriptions payable in advance.

Published by JOSEPH MASON, No. 102 Broadway, NEW-YORK; Otis, Broaders, & Co. and Jordan & Co. *Boston*; Weare C. Little, *Albany*; J. R. Pollock, *Philadelphia*; N. Hickman, *Baltimore*; J. Gill, *Richmond*; W. H. Berritt, *Charleston*; W. T. Williams, *Savannah*; General agent for Canada, John Nimmo.

PHILADELPHIA ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE.

No. 31, North Fifth street.

The National Anti-Slavery Standard, will be issued regularly from this office, on Thursday of every week.

TERMS—the same as in New-York; i. e. $2,00 a year if paid in advance; $2,50 if not paid within six months. $10,00 in advance will pay for six copies for one year; sent to one address; and $30,00 will pay for twenty copies.

A full assortment of anti-slavery publications is kept constantly on hand. Also, a handsome variety of miscellaneous books, and useful and fancy stationery.

All letters relating to the business of the office should be directed to *J. Miller McKim*, No. 31 North Fifth st.

LOCAL AGENTS FOR THE STANDARD.

EDWARD M. DAVIS, Philadelphia, Penn.
J. MILLER M'KIM,